THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLIII, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1960

CONTENTS

Union Troubles a Catholic Concern. *John E. Coogan, S.J.* 217

Modernistic Art and Divine Worship. *Rudolph G. Bandas* 228

The International Pontifical Marian Academy. *Leone Rosato, O.F.M.* 236

The *Sacrorum Antistitum* and the Background of the Oath Against Modernism. *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 239

Huiothesia: The Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites. *Martin W. Schoenberg, O.S.C.* 261

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and John P. McCormick, S.S.

Images in Windows 274

The Rosary in the Eastern Church 274

The Leonine Prayers 275

Sung Lessons on Ember Days 276

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

Psychiatric and Hypnotic Treatment of an Adolescent..... 277

Certainty of the Fulfillment of the Premarital Guarantees... 279

BOOK REVIEWS

The Necessity of the Church for Salvation in Selected Theological Writings of the Past Century, *by John J. King, O.M.I.*..... 282

Platonism in Recent Religious Thought, *by William D. Geoghegan*..... 283

The Prayers of Pope Pius XII, *translated by Martin W. Schoenberg, O.S.C.*..... 283

The Lord's Prayer, *by Romano Guardini*..... 283

Thunder in the Distance, *by Jacques Leclercq*..... 285

BOOKS RECEIVED 287

HOW SHOULD PRIESTS DIRECT PEOPLE REGARDING THE MOVIES?
with APPENDIX—1957

Legion of Decency

By
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

(Reprinted by Popular Demand)

This article originally appeared in the April 1946 edition of The American Ecclesiastical Review. An Appendix has been added, and the 16-page reprint is now available in an attractively bound, paper cover.

Single copy	30¢
In lots of 10	25¢ ea.
In lots of 25	22¢ ea.
In lots of 50	20¢ ea.

Prices Postpaid

The American Ecclesiastical Review
The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D.C.

UNION TROUBLES A CATHOLIC CONCERN

Perhaps never before has public interest in the meaning of the Catholic Church for America been so consuming. We have always been under the critical gaze of the A.P.A.'s, Know-Nothings, and Ku Klux Klan, each ready to shout, "Catholics, you are not Americans." But now the whole country is looking our way, often with benevolence and with the wish that we should offer ringing evidence of our contribution to the national well-being. We are ourselves convinced that we contribute strongly to the strength and sanity of our country; that if there is an "Ugly American," he is little of our raising. However, we must take nothing for granted. However slight be our failings, we can be sure that hostile criticism will find them out. Only an infinitesimal part of anti-Catholic America makes itself visible and vocal through the psychopathic POAU. Hence we can be certain that all Catholic molehills will be made mountains.

One of the areas where Catholic influence has been most notable is that of labor unionism. Catholics have always been numerically prominent in union labor and with the passing of time have become more and more influential in its leadership. Moreover, for the past seventy years the official documents of the Church have been prominently pointed out as teaching the right of workers to organize and their need of doing so. Those documents have shown the condition of the unorganized worker as often "little better than slavery." Human dignity has been shown as demanding that, through co-operative action, laborers find the security that their isolation makes impossible. Consequently we Catholics have noted with satisfaction the move toward "togetherness" among American workers until our unions today include perhaps 17 million. Our Catholic contribution to this movement has been generally recognized and appreciated. A sign of this appreciation is the fact that the position of Secretary of Labor in the President's cabinet has come to be looked upon as peculiarly Catholic. This even when no other cabinet position seems open to us and when we are very much under-represented in the national administration.

But the national recognition of our special sponsorship of labor unionization puts us in a position of special responsibility. Whether

or not we are given credit for the benefits coming from unionism, we are spotlighted when things go wrong. And while the friends of unionism can point to its tremendous achievements, there is no doubt that in some respects union affairs tend to go tremendously wrong. The some-fifty volumes of the hearings of the McClellan Senate Committee thoroughly document that fact. And as Senator McClellan remarked in summary, the investigations merely scratched the surface. If we Catholics are notably responsible for the fact of unionism, we must be responsible for seeing that it works, that it fulfills its promise.

Heretofore we Catholics may have felt less than our personal share of the responsibility for American unionism because we have had the idea that in championing it we were only following in the footsteps of Leo XIII, the "Pope of the working man," and of his successors to our own day. But the too little realized fact is that not a single one of those spokesmen has urged the formation of the secularized type of union that is universal in this country. As Paul Weber, that intelligent and apostolic representative of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, has remarked under the imprimatur of the late Cardinal Mooney:

> It is plain that all too many of us are laboring under a serious confusion when we talk about Catholicism and unionism. The trouble is that we in the United States are talking about a different kind of union than those the Popes had in mind when they laid down the rules. The puzzled Catholic is instinctively right in his refusal to attribute to existing unions all the virtues which the Popes ascribed to "workingmen's associations" of a quite different character.[1]

Weber had reference to such warnings of the need of religious guidance for unionism as were spoken by Popes Leo XIII, St. Pius X, and Pius XI. Thus we have Leo declaring in his *Graves de Communi* that the cure of our industrial ills is moral, not secular. "That," he insists, "is the reason why in encouraging Catholics to form associations that might better the lot of the working class, or in furthering other designs of this kind, We have never failed at the same time to warn them that such things must

[1] *ACTU: Principles and Methods of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists.* An American Program for Unionism. Approved by the Most Rev. Edward Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit, n.d., p. 13.

not be attempted without the sanction of religion, without including it in our plans and calling on its aid."[2]

What St. Pius X added regarding the inadequacy of other than truly Catholic labor unions (his words were repeated and underlined by Pius XI) is reflected by two social apostles, Msgr. John A. Ryan and Father Joseph Husslein, in their volume, *The Church and Labor*. The book is an official document, "prepared and edited for the Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Council." Ryan and Husslein tell us that St. Pius X, in permitting Catholics to belong even to a *Christian* labor union three-fourths of whose membership was Catholic, insists that those Catholics must also join a strictly Catholic organization which would supply the elements lacking from any union other than Catholic. Here Ryan and Husslein remark:

> Such is the express ruling wisely made in these circumstances. Its application to countries where not even Christian labor unions, but purely neutral trade unions exist, is clear. The Catholic workingman belonging to such a union stands even much more in need of Catholic social instruction and every effort must be made to see that his faith is guarded, while correct economic principles are given to him and he is helped to realize all his justified ideals and ambitions.[3]

In the United States the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists arose to supply Catholic members of our secularized unions with the essential religious aids and inspirations. But ACTU was never welcomed by the union heads, not even by the Catholics. Never large, today its membership is probably much less than five hundred for the entire United States. Consequently American unionism is left with few of the religious aids that Leo XII, St. Pius X, and Pius XI declared *essential*. That papal judgment was reemphasized ten years ago in a Rome-approved document that has been strangely neglected by the all-out champions of our labor unions, even the clerics. The document is the 1950 Joint Pastoral of the 25 Archbishops and Bishops of the Civil Province of Quebec. Of that Pastoral the appropriate Roman authority, the Cardinal Secretary of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, tells us, "The august

[2] Joseph Husslein, S.J. (editor), *Social Wellsprings*. Fourteen Epochal Documents by Pope Leo XIII (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1940), p. 235.

[3] Ryan and Husslein, *The Church and Labor* (New York: Macmillan, 1924), p. 126.

teachings of the Sovereign Pontiffs . . . could not have been more happily applied to present economic and social conditions in Canada." The Cardinal adds that since the problems this Pastoral studies are substantially those of the entire Catholic world, the Pastoral "attains universal value." In the Pastoral the Quebec hierarchy say of the deficiency of non-Christian unions:

> The mass of the workers receive their education almost insensibly from the association to which they belong. The spirit, the vigor which pervades the organized unit proceeds from the mind and heart of the leaders. That vigor reaches afterwards all the members and conveys to them a particular concept of social life and professional relations. *Hence the association is formative.* It will be such in a Christian way, if it expressly adheres, in its very constitutions, to the social principles of Christianity, and if the leaders who shape its actions are capable, through their living faith in the authority of Christ and the Church, of submitting their conscience as leaders to those principles. *Otherwise the association will lead the workers astray to materialism; it will imbue him with a false concept of life eventually made known by harsh claims, unjust methods, and the omission of the collaboration necessary to the common good.*[4]

The unions thus described are Canadian extensions of our own familiar American unions, headed by men whose names are household words among us. And the conduct of those unions is the familiar material of the findings of the McClellan Committee.

We do not question that only the secular type of union is possible in our pluralistic country; neither do we question that our Bishops have given their at least tacit permission for such membership. Nor do we question that defective unions are better than no unions at all. But we must insist that in lending our support to such unionism we have obligated ourselves to confess their essentially defective nature and labor strenuously to prevent our country from suffering unnecessarily from their deficiencies. Critics of the contribution of Catholics to America can fairly question whether we are facing up to our obligation arising from our energetic sponsorship of those unions. The distinguished authority, Roscoe Pound, former dean of Harvard University Law School, can charge again and again that the impunity of lawless unionism is unique in

[4] *Pastoral: The Problem of the Worker* (Montreal, Palm Publishers, 1950), pp. 40 ff. (Italics ours).

America. Even George Meany can complain that there seem to be two laws in our country, one for labor unions (often allowing crime to go unwhipped of justice), the other for the rest of us. The well known Liberal, Max Eastman, one-time professor of philosophy at Columbia University, can insist without adequate reply that "No man with his eyes open can fail to see that, in the United States, the power of the captains of organized labor is growing to a point where it should be regarded as a potential threat to freedom."[5] And Father James Gillis, former editor of the *Catholic World* and one of the outstanding priests of our time, can declare in almost his dying words:

> Labor leaders have become quite as tyrannical as the capitalists of years ago, and the people at large have come to condone the sins and crimes of Labor. . . . Stranger still, . . . professional Labor which has quite generally come to violate justice and right, does so in the name of philanthropy, humanity and religion.[6]

Against those mounting evils in the unionism we Catholics have so strongly sponsored, what remedies have our champions of those unions attempted to apply? We have Msgr. Hubert A. Maino of Detroit pointing out the obvious fact that union publications are doing their best to dig a Grand Canyon between the employer and the worker; he complains thus:

> If you read the general run of publications put out by labor unions, you might easily get the impression that nearly all employers remain essentially similar to the industrial "robber barons" of the turn of the century. They are portrayed as fattening on an inexhaustible flow of ill-gotten gains, while they scheme cynically to defraud the laborer of his hire and the public of its hard-earned cash.[7]

We have Ed Marciniak, too, associate editor of the Catholic magazine *Work,* calling attention to the fact that during the entire independent existence of the A. F. of L., a period of nearly seventy-five years, the opening sentence of its constitution dedicated the organization to the class struggle: "A struggle is going on in all

[5] Max Eastman, in *New Leader,* Dec. 29, 1952, pp. 17 ff.

[6] James Gillis, *This Mysterious Human Nature* (New York: Scribner, 1956), p. 180.

[7] Hubert A. Maino, in *Michigan Catholic,* cited in *Brooklyn Tablet,* Feb. 2, 1957: "Employers Not 'Robber Barons.'"

the nations of the civilized world," it tells us, "a struggle between the capitalist and the laborer, which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results to the toiling millions, if they are not combined for mutual protection and benefit."[8] It is then not surprising that the very union-minded *Commonweal* has to confess that worker class antagonism has grown so violent that "many times it is difficult not to get the impression during labor-management negotiations that the workers cannot wait to go out on strike and are reluctant to go back to work. It has been pointed out that men strike not so much for better wages, hours and conditions, but simply to express their deep hatred of their employers, their work and their way of life."[9] Such individual warning-cries are raised by Catholic protagonists of secularized unions, but there is no sustained voice. The sum total of these protests gives no suggestion that secular unionism has always been—in the papal mind—a dubious proposition, tolerable only where Christian unionism is impossible, and that while being tolerated it is to be watched carefully and given every needed moral and religious corrective.

It is a sad fact that the apparent Catholic partisanship for (secularized) unionism is alienating the confused in our Church membership, so that some "walk no more with us." It is not safeguard enough that a few spokesmen like the Reno Bishop Robert J. Dwyer should explain that "The Church is *not* for Labor to the exclusion of all other claims of right and justice . . . The Church has never made the fatal error of conceiving that Labor and its problems are her sole concern, or that other elements of the social structure should be ignored and forgotten."[10] The fact that even in the controversy regarding *compulsory* unionism the publicly expressed Catholic voice has been overwhelmingly in favor of permitting such compulsion—despite the deficiencies of our unions—has been taken as evidence enough of our partisan position. Many Catholics remaining loyal to the Church are still confused at such partisanship, and non-Catholics are left in wonderment.

[8] Ed Marciniak, "The Catholic Church and Labor," in Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., *The Catholic Church in the United States* (Chicago: Fides, 1956), pp. 269 ff.

[9] *Commonweal,* "The Decline of Radicalism," June 15, 1956, p. 271.

[10] Bishop Robert J. Dwyer, *The Nevada Register,* Oct. 15, 1954: "Sage and Sand," p. 1.

This wonderment is becoming more critical as industrial disorder spreads. The recent 116-day nationwide steel strike, Catholic led, deepened the wonder at the lack of Catholic protest. Today a second national industrial dislocation has arisen that reasonably calls for Catholic attention. This lies in the combined insistence of our Class I railroads that they are being positively bankrupt by so-called "feather-bedding" rules—work rules that force them to pay an aggregate of $500 million annually for work not done or not needed, for services not performed. Various secular magazines of enormous circulation have carried articles agreeing with management's claims, but at present writing what Catholic magazine has shown itself aroused by the story? If railroad management is in error, it should be told so emphatically. If it is even substantially correct, it has a right to our corrective co-operation, for we are—as we have seen—very notably responsible for the strength of American unionism.

The railroad management claim is that they are being held to work rules that are forty years old; that they have tried in vain time out of mind to win from labor a revision of those rules. But management is in an unequal bargaining position: it cannot threaten to suspend operations, while unions can and do threaten a nationwide strike. Consequently each contract renewal sees labor substantially winning its demands and the management left bogged down with the outmoded work rules. That management has a case is confirmed by the federally appointed Emergency Board 109, announcing in 1955 its conclusion that "there is imperative need in this industry, and specifically in the operating classifications, for a thoroughgoing review and modernization of the internal wage structure. Indeed, such a review and rationalization is long overdue . . ."[11] The Senate Commerce Subcommittee in 1959 confirmed the finding of the Emergency Board 109, adding that "there should be reappraisal of the entire railroad labor situation in the light of the present plight of the railroads."[12] Finally, the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1959 announced as the result of a three-year study that "irrespective of denials by certain representatives of labor organizations, the circumstances in this proceeding emphatically point to the conclusion that a comprehensive review

[11] *Facts About Feather Bedding in the Railway Industry* (Association of American Railroads, 1960), p. 6. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

and revision of the working rules for the railroad employees should be made."[13]

We can here mention only a few of the work rules that seem obviously outmoded. The first is that which "continues to regard 100 miles or any part thereof as the equivalent of a basic work day for most members of train crews, although with today's modern diesel locomotives and highspeed trains, 100 miles is many times only two hours' work or less." That work rule, for example, costs the railroad four basic days' wages for the 8½ hours of on-duty time required for the Minneapolis to Chicago run. It also entitles the entire engine crew to nine basic days' pay for the 16-hour New Orleans to Chicago run. Because of the rule, eight engine crews are required to operate a name passenger train over the 961-mile, 16-hour course between New York City and Chicago. The workers involved call such assignments "Red Apple" runs, and insist that they are not numerous. But they are gross impositions and should be done away with.

Another work rule which the management objects to is that requiring train crews for self-mobile machines. Thus a ditching machine operating on a yard track must carry a way engineer and fireman for actual service while paying an engine service engineer and a fireman for merely being present. Should the actually working engineer or fireman fail some day to show up, the bystanding engineer or fireman would claim double pay for replacing him. Again, we have the case of a steam roller being used to repair asphalt surfaces around a station. Should it spend a few minutes rolling down an asphalt strip between the rails at a pedestrian crossing, a train crew might claim and be given pay for *not* having been used for the track operation. Abuses of the rule are multiple and fantastic.

But a far more costly example of feather-bedding is the necessity of maintaining a fireman on a diesel engine in freight or yard service. The railroad unions insist that despite the fact that there are no fires on diesels, a fireman on a freight engine is an absolute necessity. However, the matter has been thoroughly and repeatedly gone into by neutral boards in Canada and their decision is a denial of the need of such firemen. Thus a Royal Commission having investigated the need of such firemen in freight or yard service

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

(the only type of service in which management either in Canada or the United States objects to their presence) concluded: "Their functions have either totally disappeared . . . or are a mere duplication of what is discharged by another or others . . ."[14] As a consequence of such reports the same international union which in the United States insists upon the need of the diesel freight fireman has in Canada agreed to his gradual elimination.

Union officials complain that the Canadian investigating boards contained no experienced trainmen; the intention was rather to have them strictly nonpartisan. Moreover, the questions involved were not technical. If on a whole day's run the only demand made upon the freight fireman was the securing of a jug of water, his presence was evidently not essential.[15] Moreover, he is not a mechanic and would only worsen things if he tried to function as such. And as for lookout service, the front end brakeman rides on the engine on all through freights. Safety records do not show that a third man on the engine is an asset. Union spokesmen often cite emphatic testimony to the need of a diesel fireman but they fail commonly to distinguish between passenger and freight service. Management has raised no objection to the passenger engine diesel fireman. And even as to the freight fireman, management does not insist upon his discharge. It is willing to continue to employ the present freight firemen, merely failing to replace them when their places become vacant through promotion or retirement.

One of the most disturbing features of the railroad union attitude towards the charge of feather-bedding is its Khrushchev-like insistence that the charge is too absurd to be discussed. The unions instead point out what they say is the special and growing productivity of railroad labor, saying nothing of the fact that billions of dollars have been poured into labor-saving equipment, doubling the capital investment per employee between 1945 and 1958. The unions claim that the railroads are more prosperous financially than ever before, pointing to their net profits as proof. However, those familiar with federal tax-account requirements know that the charges permitted for depreciation and replacements are in dollars of lessened buying power, consequent upon continuous inflation;

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[15] Joe Alex Morris, "What Is Railroad 'Featherbedding'?" *Saturday Evening Post*, Feb. 27, 1960, pp. 32 ff.

and that replacement costs are far higher than the sums saved to cover them. Consequently much of the cost of replacements must be taken from the so-called net profits. The actual dividends payable to railroad stockholders are less—percentagewise—than the interest paid on tax-exempt government bonds. Even in the railroads' *best* postwar year, their profit rate has been less than that of any other major industry group in its *worst* postwar year. Nevertheless, union spokesmen reply, the stock-market value of railroad securities has increased tremendously. The reasons for this are not hard to find. The inflated dollar naturally results in inflated prices of claims on real property. Moreover, many investors have turned to stocks to save themselves from further losses through inflation. Too, the billions put into new and labor saving equipment obviously increased the value of railroad properties.

Union spokesmen in their franker moments admit that the railroads are the "outstanding, unsubsidized, sick man of transportation," as Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller recently characterized them. But the unions deny responsibility for the sickness. Instead they declare that in the 12-year period 1946-1957, "the taxpayers (including the railroads)poured almost $16-billion into competitive forms of transportation. During the same period the railroads paid $9-billion in taxes, creating a $25-billion operational disparity between the railroads and their competitors." In consequence, the unions declare, "No industry could withstand the impact of such a disparity in such a short period of time without serious effects on the industry's competitive position, financial structure, fixed facilities, service, and the labor force. The railroads and their employees know from experience."[16] This subsidization vs. taxation, the union leaders emphatically conclude, *"is the basic cause of railroad deterioration."* We can admit as much without feeling any more kindly towards feather-bedding. Relief from the discriminatory tax burden and the rival-subsidizing can come only from the Government. The unions themselves can stop the feather-bedding, and in decency they should do so. We do not mean that a frank opening of the whole work rule question would show the need of concessions only by the unions. The situation could be one of give and take. The unions charge that straight

[16] *Rail Review and Report* (Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, AFL-CIO, Sept. 1959), p. 2.

hourly payment for time actually worked would at times show them woefully underpaid. If so, let adjustment be made. But it will not do for the unions to compare their hourly rate for steady work with the hourly rates of coal miners and bricklayers whose rates are inflated precisely because of the seasonal nature of their employment.

To sum up, then. Such secular unionism as we find under fire in the railroad dispute is a fact, a threatening fact in our industrial life. We Catholics are especially responsible for its presence among us. Hence we must be responsible for helping make such unions work. Leo XIII in urging unionization called for our co-operation with its efforts, telling us:

> Every minister of holy Religion must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind, and all the strength of his endurance. . . . By every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people. And above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves, and try to arouse in others, whether highly placed or lowly, charity, the mistress and queen of virtues.[17]

Charity must as its first fruits do justice. And justice requires that the whole question of railroad feather-bedding be frankly opened to the public gaze by the co-operative efforts of union and management alike. Let us insist publicly and privately that that be done. Railroad management reasonably asks, "If there is nothing to hide, why do union leaders so strenuously oppose public impartial examination of the case? Here truly is the $500 million question." The unions can trust the American public to interpret the facts reasonably and to support the unions' reasonable demands. As the very union-minded Clark Kerr, president of the University of California, has recently said, "The union attitude of limited class warfare directed at the surrounding society . . . is no longer required by the new situation."[18]

JOHN E. COOGAN, S.J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Indiana.

[17] Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum,* in *Social Wellsprings,* p. 204.

[18] Clark Kerr, in *Unions and Union Leaders of Their Own Choosing* (Fund for the Republic, 1958), p. 21.

MODERNISTIC ART AND DIVINE WORSHIP

In our day we are witnessing a peculiar outbreak of ugliness and brutality in the domain of art; yes, even in the field of Christian art. This morbid epidemic has the character of a deforming arthritism or elephantiasm or leprosy in art. In some instances it seems to be a return to the artistic productions of the cave man: certain paintings in their workmanship do not surpass the figures in the caves of primitive man. In fact, the late Cardinal Constantini, chairman of the Pontifical Academy of Art, speaks of "visual blasphemies" and "figurative horrors" in modernistic art, arousing a sense of repugnance and disgust. Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the saints are pictured with cretinic faces and with hands and feet affected with elephantiasis. Christ on the Cross is portrayed as degraded and almost animal-like. We meet saints with monkey faces and in attitudes that remind one of a mental hospital or an institution for abnormal diseases. Many suspect—and not without reason—that we are face to face here with the infiltrations of Communism seeking to make religion ridiculous and repulsive, especially to the children.

A decree of the Holy Office in 1952 listed the requirements which a work of art must fulfill before it can gain admittance into a sacred edifice. The following must be the marks of acceptable religious art:

1) It must enhance the beauty of the house of God; it must not be unworthy of the house of prayer and the majesty of God; it must not involve anything unbefitting and unbecoming, since sanctity belongs to the house of God.

2) It must engender and foster the faith and piety of the faithful; it must not disturb or in any way diminish the piety of the people.

3) It must not contain anything unusual in appearance; disordered, distorted and confused executed without proper decency and respect (Canon 1279); in bad taste and causing scandal; foreign to the mind and decrees of the Church.

4) It must be dogmatically correct, and must not be an occasion of error to the unlearned.

5) It must severely exclude second-rate and stereotyped statues and effigies.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, again touches on the question of art in his Encyclical, *Musicae Sacrae* (Christmas, 1955), and affirms that all art must be subject to the laws of God and be in conformity with man's last end. God is inseparable from the universe as a whole as well as from each and every part of it. Hence, art, which depicts nature or human conduct, cannot abstract from the Creator, from God's moral laws, and from man's last End. Consciousness of these great principles will not only not detract from, but will ennoble and perfect the artist's work. This will be especially true if he deals with religious and sacred subjects. And here we come to a capital requirement for genuine religious art; namely, a deep and reverent faith of the artist. Says Pius XII:

> The artist who does not profess the truths of faith or who strays far from God in his attitude or conduct should never turn his hand to religious art. He lacks, as it were, that inward eye with which he might see what God's majesty and His worship demand. Nor can he hope that his works, devoid of religion as they are, will ever really breathe the piety and faith that befit God's temple and His holiness even though they may show him to be an expert artist who is endowed with visible talent. Thus, he cannot hope that his works will be worthy of admission into the sacred buildings of the Church, the guardian and arbitor of religious life.

THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

In this section we shall lay down a few theological principles concerning the concrete visible representation of divine mysteries and supernatural truths.

GOD: The Old Testament forbade representations of God for fear that the Jewish people might fall into idolatry. His proper Name, "I am Who am" (*Exod.* 3:14), placed the concept of God outside of all material representation. The prophets described Him as a venerable old man who does not grow old: He is the "Ancient of days" (*Dan.* 7:9, 13, 22). Christian iconography took over this concept of Daniel only at a later date. In view of the extensive pagan worship of statues and pictures, the Church exercised a prudent restraint in representing God under a human figure. At the end of the fifth century it expressed the idea and Providence of God by means of a hand extending from a cloud, basing the

image on the following Scriptural texts: "Thy right hand, O Lord, is magnified in strength" (*Ps.* 117:16). This image is of frequent occurrence in the miniatures and mosaics of Byzantine art.

THE BLESSED TRINITY: As the most august mystery of our holy religion, the Blessed Trinity does not easily admit of representation. Benedict XIV gives us for our guidance the following directive: "Images of the Blessed Trinity which are commonly approved and may safely be permitted are those which represent the Person of God the Father in the form of a venerable patriarch, taken from *Dan.* 7:9: 'The Ancient of days sat'; in His bosom His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, God and Man, and between both the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, in the form of a dove" (*Bullarium Rom.*, p. 318). In order to emphasize the role of the Blessed Trinity in the work of the Redemption some artists represent the Father as receiving on His knees the Body of the Crucified Christ; others, as Durer, represent the Eternal Father as supporting by His arm the Victim of the Cross over Whom hovers the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove.

THE HOLY GHOST: Adhering closely to the Scriptural narrative of the apparition of the Third Person at the Baptism of Our Lord in the Jordan (*Matt.* 3:13-17), Christian artists usually represented the Holy Ghost under the form of a dove. In representations of Pentecost the Holy Spirit is placed at the top of the picture under the form of a radiant dove surrounded by a nimbus, while a fiery tongue hovers over the head of each Apostle. Since the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and from the Son, He is often placed beneath the figures of the First and Second Persons; but since He is the bond of love which unites the two Persons He is also placed between the Father and the Son.

JESUS CHRIST: In judging images and representations of Our Lord it is well to keep in mind the following great dogmatic truths:

(a) *Jesus Christ is God:* His Person is divine, operating through the divine and human natures. His divine nature is resplendent in and radiates through His human nature. Since actions are attributed to a Person, and since His person is divine, all His actions reveal the perfection of a Divine Being and make Him a most perfect Model and Exemplar worthy of all our imitation. Any artistic work depicting our Lord which does not do justice to those great truths is not worthy of the name of art.

(b) *Jesus Christ is true man:* Nay more, He is the most beautiful among the sons of man (*Psalm* 44:3). Jesus Christ did not come into the world through the ordinary process of generation. His body was fashioned miraculously in the chaste womb of Mary through the supernatural activity of the Holy Spirit. Now a work must reflect the perfection of the author, and only perfection can be predicated of a Divine Agent. True, in a prophetic chapter in *Isaias* (*c.* 53) the future Messias is described as being without "beauty and comeliness." But this passage refers exclusively to the sufferings of the Servant of Jahve.

Since Our Lord was conceived miraculously, He was free from original sin as well as from all the consequences of original sin. He was impeccable, because His Person was divine and all holy. He was Sinless, full of grace, free from all actual sin and inordinate tendencies. While he assumed these imperfections which were in keeping with the end of the Incarnation—for example, hunger, thirst, fatigue—He was free from all defective embryonic growth, physical defects, sickness and disease, all of which are consequences of original sin.

In trying to convey to others some notion of the Person of the Redeemer, the artist should not forget the present, risen and glorified state of the Redeemer at the right hand of God. Christ rose and is at this moment in the *aetas perfecta,* in the age of physical perfection. The scars of the Passion and Crucifixion have disappeared, the risen Christ has an integral and complete and perfect body. That risen body of His is impassible—no longer subject to suffering; it is agile—capable of moving quickly from one place to another; it is subtile—capable of passing through matter and closed doors; it is permanently resplendent with that brightness of which the apostles caught only a glimpse on Mt. Tabor at the Transfiguration.

Now, does modernistic art try to bring into relief these immortal truths of the Gospel? Hardly; in fact, it might be said that modernistic works of Catholic artists are caricatures of these sublime verities, they are illustrated blasphemies, a total rejection of the venerable traditions of the Church.

IMAGES OF THE CRUCIFIED SAVIOUR: The Catholic artist who proposes to depict the Crucified Lord should carefully

keep in mind the following great truths: Christ is God; He is consubstantial with the Father, possessing numerically one and the same immutable and inammisible divine nature. There can be no schism within the divine nature, and hence even on the Cross there was no interruption or cessation of the communion of mutual love between the Father and the Son. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that no Father of the Church interpreted the words of Our Lord on the Cross—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me" (*Matt.* 27:46)—in the sense of a real abandonment of the Son by the Heavenly Father; many, following the teaching of St. Augustine, maintain that Christ spoke these words of infinite sadness as Head of the human race. Let the artist then carefully exclude from his representation of the Saviour on the Cross anything incompatible with the hypostatic union.

There is still another dogmatic truth which the Catholic artist must keep in mind: Christ's soul possessed the Beatific Vision permanently from the first moment of His conception, although by His own Will He prevented the glory of the soul from overflowing on His body before the Resurrection. Hence, Our Lord did not have virtues incompatible with the Beatific Vision—the virtues of faith and hope. Hence, too, He could not die of despair which is a loss of confidence and hope. Much less did He die of a "broken heart." As we pointed above, Christ had a perfect human nature. His heart was not diseased but physically perfect. A healthy heart does not break of itself. For the same reason, the heart of Jesus cannot be said to have broken because of grief over man's sins. Christ's consciousness of His exact mission and the fullness of His knowledge precluded all despair. Our Lord Himself said: "I lay down my life, that I may take it up again. No man taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself and I have power to lay it down, and power to take it up again" (*John* 10:17-18). We might note, too, that Christian Tradition represented Christ on the Cross not as *victus* but as *victor,* as the King triumphant over death: *Regnavit a ligne Deus: Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit;* and again:

Pange, Lingua, gloriosi,
Lauream certaminis
Et super crucis trophaeo
Dic triumphum nobilem

If only Catholic artists kept some of these truths in mind and were guided by them, our churches, rectories, convents and institutions would not be cluttered with the monstrosities which have found their way into them.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY: In their representations of Mary artists have from time immemorial struggled with two concepts which at first sight seem irreconcilable and which require rare tact and ability in him who must associate them in one and the same artistic production: Mary's Virginity and divine Maternity. Furthermore, she was always free from all sin, both original and actual, as well as from all inclinations to sin. There was nothing defective or disordered in her physical growth and development. She was not subject to disease, sickness and senility. Theologians agree in teaching that, if she died, she died not because of bodily deterioration but out of love of God without any pain or death agony, and that her body was not subject to corruption. And now in her risen state in heaven her body enjoys all the blessed qualities of a glorified body. Let the artist again pause before these truths when about to sculpture or paint a representation of the ever Blessed Virgin and Mother of God.

ANGELS: "Angel," in the Greek language, means "messenger." Angels are pure spirits, superior to men in knowledge and power, created by God to adore, love and serve Him. A particular duty of angels is to be the protectors of nations and guardians of individual man (*Matt.* 18:10; *Acts* 2:15). Traditional Christian art represents angels as winged adolescents. Youth is an emblem of force and grace. The wings are an emblem of their spirituality, mastery over space, promptness and speed in carrying out the mandates of God, immortality.

SAINTS: The Saints are men who attained a special degree of perfection, exercised Christian virtues in a heroic degree, and often sacrificed their lives for the faith. When an artist is called upon to represent a Saint, he should obtain adequate information on the life of the Saint, the time and environment in which he lived, the iconographic forms which tradition has already assigned to him, the particular devotional practices connected with his feast, etc. The drapery adopted should be in conformity with history, the Saint's state of life, and iconographic tradition. Saints who did not belong to a religious order may not be represented in the habit of

a religious (Urban VIII, Constitution of March 15, 1642). It should be the artist's task to make the Saint's image radiant with his particular virtue.

DEFORMED ART AND THE LITURGY

Deformed art is not liturgical. All Christian art is destined in one way or another to be associated with Christian worship. Now worship is both internal and external. Art belongs to external cult —although the eloquence of outward beauty also moves the soul and thus serves to promote internal cult. Art, then, which has the noble office of rendering to God the homage of adoration, should be endowed with the most exquisite beauty. How then can the artist presume to render glory to God by disfiguring the human form on which God has impressed his own image and likeness? How can such an image of man reflect and radiate the beauty which God has kindled in his face: "The light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us" (*Ps.* 4:7). Art is visual prayer; modernistic deformed art not only savours of contempt for the divine but may well border on the sacrilegious.

Deformed art is not catechetical: In our day an attempt is being made to substitute abstract art for figurative art—but wrongly so. Judaism and Islamism, it is true, forbade the representation of the human form. But Christianity is a religion of the Incarnation: "The word was made flesh." Jesus Christ came as man, so that we may see Him and adore His humanity. Abstract art smacks of the heresy of Docetism which denied the bodily reality of Christ. It is also an anti-artistic procedure. Art is rapid and easy intuition. It speaks to the imagination and not to the reasoning faculty. Making art a process of solving enigmas is reducing art to a cabal. Sacred art has above all the duty of nourishing the devotion and piety of the faithful. The imposing church façades of the Middle Ages, portraying the majesty of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin, of the Last Judgment, were great catechisms in sculpture. The interior of the cathedrals were vast and rather dark. The rich stained glass windows gave life to the architectural complex, and offered to the piety of the faithful the radiant pictures of the life of Christ, of Our Lady, of the Saints. Why should we reject and destroy this great artistic, liturgical and catechetical life in our churches, and replace it with the hieroglyphics of abstract art? Why

should we replace this clear and artistic catechism—a joy to the eyes of the soul—with a pictorial puzzle?

The teacher of Christian doctrine must speak with clearness, accuracy and dignity. Deformed art lacks all these basic qualities. It leads to confusion of ideas, makes religious teaching distasteful, and Christianity itself ridiculous and repulsive.

Let us quote, in conclusion, the words of the distinguished architect, Benedict Williamson, who, in his work "How to Build a Church," says: "Either those who produce such things do not know how to sculpture or paint a human form, and in that case they are not artists and should not be permitted to produce such monstrosities; or, they know how to paint and sculpture, but do not wish to do so; and this is infinitely worse. It may be that this disease which afflicts certain artists grows from the desire to be original; if this is the case, they have failed miserably because the children in the first grade produce any amount of such things and have always done so" (quoted by Cardinal Constantini in *Fede ed arte*).

Some of these modernistic artists contend that they are seeking their inspiration in copies of ancient Christian art. But this is infantilism in art. Besides, in the early Christian era the human race was emerging from the corruptions and sensualism of paganism, and art did not attain that idealistic perfection, which it reached in later centuries. Stammering is natural and delightful in a child but grotesque in an adult. Christianity is not an archeological doctrine but a form of life capable of accommodating itself to all times and places and destined to endure as long as humanity.

RUDOLPH G. BANDAS

St. Paul, Minnesota

THE INTERNATIONAL PONTIFICAL MARIAN ACADEMY

On December 8, 1959, with the *Motu Proprio,* "Maiora in dies," the Holy Father, John XXIII, declared the International Marian Academy a *Pontifical Academy,* with all the rights and privileges. Thus a scant twelve years since its foundation, the International Marian Academy has been crowned with this most coveted title.

Founded in 1948 through the efforts of Carlo Balić, O.F.M., the Academy inserted itself, almost preponderantly, as it were, into the widespread Marian movement then developing fully toward the proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption.

Later, thanks to the increased number of undertakings—we need mention only the various national congresses or the "Assumption Weeks" organized in almost every nation by the Franciscans[1]—the idea was suggested of an International Marian Congress for the 1950 Holy Year.

This was the first and most complete success of the Academy. In truth, it was established with a twofold purpose. First, "to promote and foster primarily scientific studies, whether speculative or historico-critical, about our Lady" (cf. *Statuta peculiaria Academiae Marianae Internationalis,* art i; Romae, 1951, 3). Second, "to promote at determined times international congresses, Marian weeks or conferences, and to publish the acts of such events." To achieve the first purpose it publishes various collections:

Bibliotheca mariana Medii Aevi (8 volumes to date)

Bibliotheca mariana Moderni Aevi (2 volumes)

Bibliotheca assumptionis B.V. Mariae (4 volumes)

Bibliotheca immaculatae conceptionis B.V. Mariae (10 volumes)

Bibliotheca mediationis B.V. Mariae (1 volume)

Studia mariana (9 volumes)

The realization of the second purpose is known to all. Within ten years the Marian Academy had organized three International Mariologico-Marian Congresses (Rome, 1950, 1954, Lourdes,

[1] Rome, 1947; Lisbon, 1947; Madrid, 1947; Montreal, 1948; Buenos Aires, 1949; Puy-en-Velay, 1949; San Francisco, 1950.

1958). The distinctive characteristic of these Mariological Congresses was their strictly scientific and theological aspect. To these were always joined other Congresses, primarily practical and devotional, which were called "Marian" and which marked the resumption of Marian Congresses interrupted in 1912.

The importance attached to International Mariologico-Marian Congresses by the Holy See can easily be substantiated by the coinciding, certainly not fortuitous, of the celebration of the first two Congresses with the definition of the dogma of the Assumption in 1950 and the proclamation of the Queenship of Mary in 1954.

The Academy acquired world renown through the participation at Mariological Congresses of theologians from every religious Order, from every University and from every corner of the world, as well as through the impressive participation of the Hierarchy and of the faithful in the Marian Congresses. Through the publication of the acts of the Congresses in three collections (*Alma Socia Christi:* 13 volumes; *Virgo Immaculata:* 22 volumes; and *Maria et Ecclesia:* approximately 20 volumes)—true modern encyclopedias on Mariology—and through the continued publication in the *Bibliotheca Mariana* of books that are distinguished because of their scientific accuracy, their rigorous method, their faultless printing, the International Marian Academy has become, according to the famous Jesuit theologian, De Aldama, "the most important center of Mariological investigation in the world."[2]

The *Motu Proprio,* "Maiora in dies," now gives official confirmation of the excellent merits of the International Marian Academy already recognized by the consensus of theologians and the adherence of eminent personalities. The most important new element in the papal document, however, is the establishment of a permanent Council for the organization of International Mariologico-Marian Congresses. In this way a gap about which many had complained for a long time has been filled, that is, the lack of a standing Council that would assure the continuation of the International Congresses. Considering the importance of such Congresses, proved by the

[2] De Aldama, in *Estudios Ecclesiasticos,* 26 (1952) 88. Many other testimonies of eminent theologians as to the scientific production of the Internal Marian Academy are collected in: *Nuntia Periodica,* No. 6 (Rome: 1959) 85-95.

great impetus given to Mariology by the celebration of the past three Congresses, we must recognize as the principal merit of the International Marian Academy the fact that it has aroused this demand for Congresses, that is, has carried it forth, made it felt in competent circles, and hastened an answer to this need, and finally that it has obtained the establishment of a permanent Council.[3]

It is to be hoped that the continuation of the Mariologico-Marian Congresses, now assured by the papal document, will in time (through catechetics and preaching) succeed in transferring the gains of theological science to the Christian people. Thus would be eliminated that difference so often deplored by the Popes between Marian piety (lacking theological foundations in many) and Mariological and theological sciences (which risk remaining pure speculation unless translated into vital, living teaching).

In revealing his august intentions leading to the promulgation *motu proprio* of the new decree, the Holy Father points to the Most Holy Virgin as the ultimate and highest hope for the unity of the Church. This is the most valuable testimony on the manner in which the silent work of the International Marian Academy and the vast modern Mariological movement within Catholicism insert themselves into the universal vision of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, of which Mary, the Virgin, the Mother of Christ, the *Alma Socia Redemptoris,* is both Mother and symbol.

LEONE ROSATO, O.F.M.

Rome, Italy

[3] For more detailed information on the activities and merits of the International Marian Academy in Mariology, cf.: C. Balić, "Il contributo dei Frati Minori al movimento mariologico moderno," in *Marianum,* 11 (1949) 440-460; *Idem.,* "L'activité de l'Académie Mariale Internationale," in *Marie* (1952) 68-70; M. Belanger, "L'Académie Mariale Internationale," in *Ere Mariale,* 1 (1956) n. 5; A. Magnire, "The International Marian Academy," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* 131 (1954) 178 ff.; P. Melada, "Internationale Marianische Akademie," in *Lexikon der Marienkunde.*

THE *SACRORUM ANTISTITUM* AND THE BACKGROUND OF THE OATH AGAINST MODERNISM

September 1 of this year marked the fiftieth anniversary of the last, and in some ways the most important, of the three main anti-Modernist pronouncements issued by the Holy See during the brilliant reign of St. Pius X. This document was the Motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum.* The other two basic anti-Modernist documents are, of course, the Holy Office decree *Lamentabili sane exitu,* dated July 3, 1907, and the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis,* issued September 8 of that same year.

The *Sacrorum antistitum* is best known because it contains the text of the famous anti-Modernist oath and the rules prescribing when and by whom this oath is to be taken. Because of the tremendous intrinsic importance of the oath itself and by reason of its function in the doctrinal life of the Catholic Church, the papal document containing this oath definitely deserves serious study by the present generation of theologians. The *Sacrorum antistitum* brings out the basic objectives which the saintly Pius X hoped to attain through the taking of the oath. These objectives, which are also the ends St. Pius X worked to achieve through the writing of the Motu proprio itself, are expressed very clearly in the introduction and in the conclusion to this document.

Since the entire text of the *Sacrorum antistitum* is not very generally available here and now, it will be helpful to see a translation of its most important parts, including the introduction and conclusion. The following is a translation of the introduction to this Motu proprio.

THE INTRODUCTION

We believe that no bishop is ignorant of the fact that the wily Modernists have not abandoned their plans for disturbing the peace of the Church since they were unmasked by the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis.* For they have not ceased to seek out new recruits and to gather them into a secret alliance. Nor have they ceased, along with their new associates, to inject the poison of their own teachings into the veins of the Christian body-politic by turning out anonymous

or pseudonymous books and articles. If, after a re-reading of the above-mentioned encyclical *Pascendi,* this audacity, which has caused Us so much grief, be considered very carefully, it will become quite apparent that these men are just as the encyclical describes them: enemies who are all the more to be feared by reason of their very nearness to us. They are men who pervert their ministry in such a way as to bait their hooks with poisoned meat in order to catch the unwary. They carry with them a form of doctrine in which the summary of all errors is contained.

While this plague is spreading abroad over that very part of the Lord's field from which the best fruits might be expected, it is the duty of all Bishops to exert themselves in defence of the Catholic faith and most diligently to see to it that the integrity of the divine deposit suffers no loss. Likewise it is most definitely Our duty to obey the commands of Christ the Saviour, who gave to Peter, to whose position of authority We, though unworthy, have succeeded, the order: "Confirm thy brethren." Thus, so that the souls of the good may be strengthened in the present struggle, We have considered it opportune to repeat the following statements and commands of the encyclical *Pascendi.*[1]

The last words of this introduction to the *Sacrorum antistitum* show that the first section of the body of this Motu proprio is a long citation from the disciplinary part of the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis.* To this citation is attached an appendix, having to do with legislation concerning seminaries. The second part of the body of the text of the *Sacrorum antistitum* contains the text of the anti-Modernist oath, together with the rules prescribing when and by whom his oath is to be taken, and the other directives which accompanied the command to take the oath. The third section is merely a statement in Latin of a text on preaching, originally issued in Italian, on the orders of Pope Leo XIII, by the Congregation of Bishops and of Regulars, on July 31, 1894.

The introduction to the *Sacrorum antistitum* contains some badly needed lessons for the priests of our own time. Incidentally it contains some reminders of truths in the theological and in the historical orders which are far too seldom insisted upon today. It will, in my judgment, be definitely helpful to take cognizance of some of these truths at this time.

[1] The Latin text of the *Sacrorum antistitum* is to be found in the *Codicis iuris canonici fontes,* cura Petri Cardinalis Gasparri editi (Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1933), III, 774-90. This particular secton is on p. 774.

(1) Basically the *Sacrorum antistitum* and the anti-Modernist oath it contains were intended by St. Pius X as works he was required to perform in order to carry out his own divinely imposed responsibility to confirm the faith of his fellow members of the Catholic Church and to strengthen the efforts of the Bishops to see to it that their flocks received the divinely revealed message in all its integrity and purity.

For the sake of both fidelity to revealed teaching and of historical veracity it is absolutely imperative that our contemporary Catholic scholars take cognizance of the truth of St. Pius X's claim about his intention. Actually the responsibility which St. Pius X had assumed when he accepted the burden of the papacy demanded that he take the most effective means at his disposal to protect the faith of Catholics. Quite obviously the greatest danger to the faith of the members of the true Church of Jesus Christ exists when some members of this Church actually teach or even show sympathy for doctrine contradictory to or incompatible with the body of Catholic dogma without receiving any reproof from those whom God has commissioned and obligated to protect the purity and the integrity of the Catholic faith. St. Pius X was acutely conscious of the fact that many influential Catholics were teaching or encouraging erroneous doctrines opposed to the divinely revealed Catholic message long after those erroneous doctrines had been pointed out and condemned by the highest teaching authority within the Church. And the saintly Pope was brilliant enough to realize that, unless he took some sort of drastic action, a great number of Catholics might be persuaded to imagine that *de facto* the Church at least tacitly tolerated the doctrinal deviations of the Modernists and their sympathizers. Thus he directed the severe commands of the *Sacrorum antistitum* towards the protection of the Catholic faith that was his most important responsibility as the Vicar of Christ on earth.

It was and it still is the contention of the Modernists, together with their sympathizers and their dupes, that St. Pius X in some way or another went beyond the bounds imposed by prudence and charity in the war he waged against the heresy of Modernism. As a matter of fact, even after the regular investigations involved in the process of his beatification had been completed, the Sacred Congregation of Rites considered it best to commission its historical section to conduct a special investigation into the validity of this

particular contention. This strict investigation, which made use of all available testimony and of the very abundant documentary material pertinent to the question, brought out very clearly the fact that St. Pius X, in issuing the *Sacrorum antistitum* and in taking the other steps against the Modernists and their supporters during the latter days of his pontificate, had been doing only what the demands of his high office demanded of him.[2]

One of the most striking indications of this is to be found in a well known statement attributed to Pope Benedict XV. The *Disquisitio* of the Historical Section of the Sacred Congregation of Rites reprints this statement in a part of the testimony offered by Msgr. Hoenning-O'Carroll in the course of the inquiry into the virtues of Pius X held in Venice.

> Particularly his [Pius X's] political dealings with France and the steps he took against Modernism were attacked as imprudent and exaggerated . . . When Father Mauro Serafini was having an audience with Pope Benedict XV, the Pope said to him: "Now that I am sitting on this Chair, I see very well how right Pius X was. While I was the Sostituto in the Secretariate of State, and even while I was Archbishop of Bologna, I did not always share the thought of Pius X, but now I have to realize how right he was."[3]

Monsignor Hoenning-O'Carroll testified that he learned of this statement of Pope Benedict XV from Monsignor Pescini. Despite the fact that this particular witness knew the story only through hearsay, the statement itself seems very well attested. It seems to reflect the mind of Pope Benedict XV.

In any event there is ample and compelling evidence that the *Sacrorum antistitum* and the other anti-Modernistic documents

[2] The documentation and the results of this investigation are contained in the *Disquisitio circa quasdam obiectiones modum agendi Servi Dei [Pii Papae X] respicientes in Modernismi debellatione, una cum summario additionali ex officio compilato,* which is n. 77 of the printed documents of the Sectio historica of the Sacra Rituum Congregatio. The work was edited by Father Antonelli, O.F.M. It is mentioned and used rather well by Pierre Fernessole, in his *Pie X: Essai historique* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1953), II, 237-51. It is employed brilliantly by Fr. Raymond Dulac in his two famous articles, "Les devoirs du journaliste catholique selon le Bienheureux Pie X," and "Simple note sur le Sodalitium Pianum," in *La pensée catholique,* n. 23 (1952), 68-87; 88-93.

[3] *Disquisitio,* p. 127. Cited by Fernessole, *op. cit.,* II, 249.

issued by St. Pius X were actually called for and really required by reason of the danger to the Catholic faith which had been caused by the activity of the Modernists, their sympathizers, and their dupes, within the true Church of Jesus Christ.

(2) At the time the *Sacrorum antistitum* was being written, the integrity of the Catholic faith itself was being seriously threatened. Within the Catholic Church itself a definite and formidable effort was being made to persuade members of the true Church to reject as antiquated and outdated certain teachings which were actually presented by the Church's *magisterium* as belonging to the deposit of divine public revelation. This effort was being made by the Modernists, most of whom were members of the Catholic Church. The teachings which these men had attempted to impose upon the Church had been specifically and authoritatively condemned by the Holy See three years before the *Sacrorum antistitum* was issued.

Thus it is immensely important to realize that the teachings against which the *Sacrorum antistitum* was directed were being put forward by an obdurate group of men whose heresies had been indicated, denounced, and condemned three years before this Motu proprio was written. This, incidentally, is quite at variance with the unhistorical statements of some contemporary sympathizers with Modernism and the Modernists. Writers of this sort have tried to delude their fellow Catholics into imagining that, upon the appearance of the *Lamentabili sane exitu* and the *Pascendi dominici gregis,* most of the men who had been teaching and defending the doctrines condemned in these two documents quickly and humbly submitted to the teaching authority of the Holy See. The text of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* and also, be it noted, the text of the *Ad beatissimi,* the inaugural encyclical of Pope Benedict XV, show that no such reaction took place.[4] The well defined group which had been proposing and favoring the propositions condemned in the

[4] It is quite evident that Pope Benedict XV considered the Modernism condemned by St. Pius X as an influential movement in the Church four years after the *Sacrorum antistitum* was written. Thus we read in the *Ad beatissimi:* "And so there came into being the monstrous errors of Modernism, which Our predecessor rightly designated as the gathering together of all the heresies, and which he solemnly condemned. To the fullest extent possible, Venerable Brethren, We here renew that condemnation. *And, because this pestiferous contagion has not yet been overcome, but even now creeps in here and there, even though in a hidden manner,* We exhort all

Lamentabili and in the *Pascendi* insolently continued to work for acceptance of their errors within the Church even after St. Pius X had denounced and condemned them.

(3) In the *Sacrorum antistitum* St. Pius X speaks out very clearly of the existence of a secret alliance or a *foedus clandestinum* among the Modernists of his day. For one reason or another, this truth, observed and stated by St. Pius X, and clearly evident to any person who takes the trouble to study the history of the Modernist movement, has always been singularly distasteful to sympathizers with Modernism and with the Modernists. It seems to have been precisely in order to cause confusion on this particular point that the men who have been partial to the Modernists have gone to such extreme lengths to delude people into imagining that the opposition to Loisy, Von Hügel, and their ilk within the Catholic Church was fundamentally the work of a secret alliance of sinister and reactionary Catholics. It would certainly appear that the ridiculous and mendacious propaganda directed against the Sodalitium Pianum and against Monsignor Umberto Benigni, even over the course of the past few years,[5] can best be explained as an attempt to cover up the fact that there was a *foedus clandestinum* connected with and inherent in the Modernist movement.

---

most diligently against any infection of this evil, to which you might rightly apply the words that Job said on another subject: 'It is a fire that devoureth even to destruction, and rooteth up all things that spring.' And We will that Catholic men should turn away in disgust, not only from the errors, but from the very mentality, or, as they call it, the spirit of the Modernists" (Cf. *Codicis iuris canonici fontes,* III, 842).

It must also be remembered that the errors denounced by the late Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani generis* definitely were Modernistic.

[5] Perhaps the most insolent and naïve of these attacks is that contained in the article "'La Sapinière,' ou brève histoire de l'organisation intégriste," written by someone who used the pseudonym "Louis Davallon," in the May 15, 1955, number of Follet's *Chronique sociale de France,* pp. 241-62. A brief discussion of this unfortunate and thoroughly untrustworthy article will be found in Fenton, "Some Recent Writings in the Field of Fundamental Dogmatic Theology," Part II, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXXIV, 5 (May, 1956), 340-45. It is tragic that an otherwise respectable book, *The Life of Benedict XV,* by Walter H. Peters (Milwaukee: Bruce 1959), incorporates some of this nonsensical propaganda against Monsignor Benigni into its chapter "Modernists and Integralists" (pp. 42-53).

(4) The introduction to the *Sacrorum antistitum* takes cognizance of the fact that most of the genuinely dangerous supporters of the Modernist movement, the men against whose efforts the *Sacrorum antistitum* and its commands were particularly directed, were priests active within the Catholic Church itself. St. Pius X took cognizance of the fact that such priests were actually perverting their own ministry. They were guilty of using their priestly power and their priestly position to counter, rather than to advance, the work of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Basically the work of the priesthood is directed towards the glory of God, which is to be achieved and obtained in the salvation of souls. This objective is to be obtained only by those who pass from this life living the life of sanctifying grace. And the life of sanctifying grace cannot exist apart from the truth faith, until such time as the faith itself is replaced by the Beatific Vision. Thus the priestly ministry in the true Church of Jesus Christ necessarily seeks to induce men to accept God's supernatural teaching with the certain assent of divine faith and works to increase the perfection and the intensity of the faith in those who already possess this virtue. Hence any effort on the part of a Catholic priest to influence people to reject or to pass over a truth revealed by God and proposed as such by the Church's *magisterium* definitely constitutes a perversion of the sacerdotal ministry.

(5) St. Pius X describes the Modernists as men "who are all the more to be feared by reason of their very nearness to us." It would be difficult indeed to appreciate the position of the Church in the twentieth century without realizing the objectivity and the shrewdness of this observation.

A man is to be feared by the Church, or by the members of the Church, in the measure that this man intends and is genuinely able to harm the Church, or to counteract and negate the salvific mission of Our Lord's Mystical Body in this world. And this happens especially when non-members of the Church are influenced not to accept its divine message and not to seek entrance into this society, and when members of the Church are pressured to reject Our Lord, or His love, or His divine teaching. It is most important to remember that the only real and serious damage to the cause of Christ is done when effective efforts are made to nullify and to

counteract the work the Church does as the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ Our Lord.

With its insistence that the Modernists and their sympathizers were "enemies who are all the more to be feared by reason of their very nearness to us," the introduction to the *Sacrorum antistitum* takes cognizance of the fact that, during our own times at least, non-members of the Church have, generally speaking, not been able to damage the Church to any very considerable extent. Quite obviously, despite their manifest and intense ill will, people like those who used to be associated with the old *Menace* and the Ku Klux Klan, and those who are now associated with groups like P. . . U, are not particularly formidable adversaries of Our Lord, His Church, or His message. They have certainly helped to stir up and further to envenom antipathy towards the Catholic Church on the part of ignorant non-Catholics who were previously ill disposed towards the Church. But it would hardly seem likely that any Catholic has ever been turned against Christ or against the Church's divinely revealed message as a result of anything that has ever been said or written by these rabble-rousers. And it seems highly unlikely that any individual has been excluded from the Beatific Vision by reason of anything he has said or done by reason of their influence.

On the other hand, no one has ever been as well placed to harm the true Church and to counteract its essential work as a Catholic priest in good standing. If such a man, by his preaching, his teaching, or his writing, actually sets forth the kind of teaching condemned in the *Lamentabili sane exitu* and in the *Pascendi dominici gregis,* or if he works to discredit the loyal defenders of Catholic dogma without receiving any repudiation or reproof from those to whom the apostolic deposit of divine revelation has been entrusted, the Catholic people are in grave danger of being deceived.

The Modernists and their most influential sympathizers were, in great part, drawn from the ranks of the Catholic clergy. Thus they were, in the words of the introduction to the *Sacrorum antistitum,* the "enemies who are all the more to be feared by reason of their very nearness to us." These Catholics who taught or favored Modernism were the men whose influence within the true Church of Jesus Christ St. Pius X sought to counter by the teaching and the directives contained in the *Sacrorum antistitum.*

(6) Finally, in the introduction to this famous Motu proprio, St. Pius X makes it very clear indeed that the Bishops of the Catholic Church were bound in conscience by the obligations of their office to act energetically against this teaching that contradicted the divinely revealed truth proposed as such by the true Church. The "defence of the Catholic faith" and strenuous efforts "to see to it that the integrity of the divine deposit suffers no loss" are definitely not works of supererogation. These are the duties prescribed by Our Lord Himself for the leaders of the Church which He has purchased by His blood.

THE CONCLUSION TO THE SACRORUM ANTISTITUM

The conclusion to this document, the last of the three great anti-Modernist declarations issued by the Holy See during the reign of St. Pius X, is even more enlightening than the introduction. In this we see how St. Pius X enunciated, more clearly than in any other document, the most fundamental position of the Modernists. The text of this conclusion follows:

> Moved by the seriousness of the evil that is increasing every day, an evil which We cannot put off confronting without the most grave danger, We have decided to issue and to repeat these commands. For it is no longer a case, as it was in the beginning, of dealing with disputants who come forward in the clothing of sheep. Now we are faced with open and bitter enemies from within our own household, who, in agreement with the outstanding opponents of the Church, are working for the overthrow of the faith. They are men whose audacity against the wisdom that has come down from heaven increases daily. They arrogate to themselves the right to correct this revealed wisdom as if it were something corrupt, to renew it as if it were something that had become obsolete, to improve it and to adapt it to the dictates, the progress, and the comfort of the age as if it had been opposed to the good of society and not merely opposed to the levity of a few men.
>
> To counter such attempts against the evangelical doctrine and the ecclesiastical tradition, there will never be sufficient vigilance or too much severity on the part of those to whom the faithful care of the sacred deposit has been entrusted.[6]

In this conclusion to the *Sacrorum antistitum,* St. Pius X expressly recognizes the fact that the Modernists and their sympathizers, the anti-anti-Modernists, were actually working, in agree-

[6] The text is in *Codicis iuris canonici fontes,* III, 789 f.

ment with the most bitter enemies of the Catholic Church, for the destruction of the Catholic faith. It is interesting and highly important to note exactly what St. Pius X said. He definitely did not claim that these men were working directly to destroy the Church as a society. It is quite obvious that, given the intimate connection between the Church and the faith, a connection so close and perfect that the Church itself may be defined as the *congregatio fidelium*, the repudiation of the Catholic faith would inevitably lead to the dissolution of the Church. Yet, for the Modernists and for those who co-operated in their work, the immediate object of attack was always the faith itself. These individuals were perfectly willing that the Catholic Church should continue to exist as a religious society, as long as it did not insist upon the acceptance of that message which, all during the course of the previous centuries of its existence, it had proposed as a message supernaturally revealed by the Lord and Creator of heaven and earth. They were willing and even anxious to retain their membership in the Catholic Church, as long as they were not obliged to accept on the authority of divine faith such unfashionable dogmas as, for example, the truth that there is truly no salvation outside of the Church.

What these men were really working for was the transformation of the Catholic Church into an essentially non-doctrinal religious body. They considered that their era would be willing to accept the Church as a kind of humanitarian institution, vaguely religious, tastefully patriotic, and eminently cultural. And they definitely intended to tailor the Church to fit the needs and the tastes of their own era.

It must be understood, of course, that the Modernists and the men who aided their efforts did not expect the Catholic Church to repudiate its age-old formulas of belief. They did not want the Church to reject or to abandon the ancient creeds, or even any of those formularies in which the necessity of the faith and the necessity of the Church are so firmly and decisively stated. What they sought was a declaration on the part of the Church's *magisterium* to the effect that these old formulas did not, during the first decade of the twentieth century, carry the same meaning for the believing Catholic that they had carried when these formulas had first been drawn up. Or, in other words, they sought to force or to delude the teaching authority of Christ's Church into coming out with

the fatally erroneous proposition that what is accepted by divine faith in this century is *objectively* something different from what was believed in the Catholic Church on the authority of God revealing in previous times.

Thus the basic objective of Modernism was to reject the fact that, when he sets forth Catholic dogma, the Catholic teacher is acting precisely as an ambassador of Christ. The Modernists were men who were never quite able to grasp or to accept the truth that the teaching of the Catholic Church is, as the First Vatican Council designated the content of the Constitution *Dei Filius,* actually "the salutary doctrine of Christ," and not merely some kind of doctrine which has developed out of that teaching. And, in the final analysis, the position of the Modernists constituted the ultimate repudiation of the Catholic faith. If the teaching proposed by the Church as dogma is not actually and really the doctrine supernaturally revealed by God through Jesus Christ Our Lord, through the Prophets of the Old Testament who were His heralds, or through the Apostles who were His witnesses, then there could be nothing more pitifully inane than the work of the Catholic *magisterium.*

It is interesting to note the parallel between what St. Pius X says about the intentions of the Modernists and what his great predecessor, Pope Leo XIII, had to say about the basic premise of the errors he pointed out and condemned in his famed letter, the *Testem benevolentiae.* St. Pius X declares that the Modernists "arrogate to themselves the right to correct this revealed wisdom as if it were something corrupt, to renew it as if it were something that had become obsolete, to improve it and to adapt it to the dictates, the progress, and the comfort of the age as if it had been opposed to the good of society and not merely opposed to the levity of a few men." And Pope Leo XIII states:

> The principles on which the new opinions We have mentioned are based may be reduced to this: that in order the more easily to bring over to Catholic doctrine those who dissent from it, the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and, relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern theories and methods. Many think that this is to be understood not only with regard to the rule of life, but also to the doctrines in which the *deposit of faith* is contained. For they contend that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those who are not in

accord with us, to pass over certain heads of doctrines, as if of lesser moment, or so to soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held.[7]

Thus, when we examine the actual texts of the *Testimonium benevolentiae* and of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* it becomes quite apparent that Pope Leo XIII and St. Pius X were engaged in combatting doctrinal deviations that actually sprang from an identical principle, the fantastically erroneous assumption that the supernatural communication of the Triune God could and should be brought up to date and given a certain respectability before modern society. The men who sustained the weird teachings condemned by Pope Leo XIII, a document which, incidentally, did not denounce any mere phantom body of doctrine, and the men who taught and protected the doctrinal monstrosities stigmatized in the *Lamentabili sane exitu* and in the *Pascendi dominici gregis,* based their errors on a common foundation. The false Americanism and the heresy of Modernism were both offshoots of doctrinal liberal Catholicism.

This belief that the meaning of the Church's dogmatic message was in some way subject to change and capable of being improved and brought up to date was definitely not an explicit part of the original or the more naïve stage of the liberal Catholic movement. The first components of liberal Catholicism, during the earlier days of the unfortunate Felicité De Lamenais, were religious indifferentism, some false concepts of human freedom, and the advocacy of a separation of Church and state as the ideal situation in a nation made up of members of the true Church. But, after these teachings had been forcefully repudiated by Pope Gregory XVI in his encyclical *Mirari vos arbitramur,* a new set of factors entered into this system. These were inserted into the fabric of liberal Catholicism because the leaders of this movement persisted in defending as legitimate Catholic doctrine this teaching which had been clearly and vigorously condemned by the supreme power of the Catholic *magisterium.* Most prominent among these newer components of liberal Catholicism were minimism, doctrinal subjectivism, and an insistence that there had been and that there had

[7] The text is in *Denz.,* n. 1967. This passage is translated in Father Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 442.

to be at least some sort of change in the objective meaning of the Church's dogmatic message over the course of the centuries.[8]

The liberal Catholic since the time of Montalembert has been well aware of the fact that the basic theses he proposes as acceptable Catholic doctrine have been specifically and vehemently repudiated by the doctrinal authority of the Roman Church. If he is to continue to propose these teachings as a member of the Church, he is obliged by the very force of self-consistency to claim that the declarations of the *magisterium* which condemned his favorite theses do not at this moment mean objectively what they meant at the time they were issued. And, if such a claim is advanced about the *Mirari vos arbitramur,* there is very little to prevent its being put forward on the subject of the Athanasian Creed. Pope Leo XIII and St. Pius X were well aware of the fact that the advocates of the false Americanism and the teachers and the protectors of the Modernist heresy were employing this same discredited tactic.

This common basis of the false doctrinal Americanism and of the Modernist heresy is, like doctrinal indifferentism itself, ultimately a rejection of Catholic dogma as a genuine supernatural message or communication from the living God Himself. It would seem impossible for anyone to be blasphemous or silly enough to be convinced, on the one hand, that the dogmatic message of the Catholic Church is actually a *locutio Dei ad homines,* and to imagine, on the other hand, that he, a mere creature, could in some way improve that teaching or make it more respectable. The very fact that a man would be so rash as to attempt to bring the dogma of the Church up to date, or to make it more acceptable to those who are not privileged to be members of the true Church, indicates that this individual is not actually and profoundly convinced that this dogmatic teaching of the Catholic Church is a supernatural communication from the living and Triune God, the Lord and Creator of heaven and earth. It would be the heighth of blasphemy knowingly to set out to improve or to bring up to date what one would seriously consider to be a genuine message from the First Cause of the universe.

The conclusion to the *Sacrorum antistitum* brings out more clearly than any other statement of the Holy See the fact that

[8] Cf. Fenton, "The Components of Liberal Catholicism," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXXXIX, 1 (July, 1958), 36-53.

Modernism sprang from the same basic principle as did the false Americanism pointed out and proscribed in the *Testem benevolentiae* of Pope Leo XIII.

THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT OF THE OATH IN THE SACRORUM ANTISTITUM

The main body of the first section of the *Sacrorum antistitum* is substantially a repetition of the legislative or disciplinary portion of the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*. To this, however, in the text of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* is added an expression of the saintly Pontiff's concern for seminaries, ending with the vigorous command that henceforth the reading of *"diaria quaevis aut commentaria, quantumvis optima"* was strictly forbidden to seminarians *"onerata moderatorum conscientia qui ne id accidat religiose non caverint."*[9]

The second section of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* the one which contains and which deals with the Oath against Modernism, follows immediately after the statement of the prohibition of the reading of newspapers by seminarians. The first part of this section is of particular importance in that it shows very clearly the effect which St. Pius X wished to produce through the taking of the oath. The section begins as follows:

> But in order to do away with all suspicion that Modernism may secretly enter in [to the seminaries], not only do We will that the commands listed under n. 2 above be obeyed absolutely, but We also order that all teachers, before their first lectures at the beginning of the scholastic year, must show to their Bishop the text which each shall decide to use in teaching, or the questions or theses that are to be treated, and that furthermore throughout the year itself the kind of teaching of each course be examined, and that if such teaching be found to run counter to sound doctrine, that this will result in the immediate dismissal of the teacher. Finally [We will] that over and above the profession of faith [the teacher] should take an oath before his Bishop, according to the formula that follows, and that he should sign his name.[10]

The *Sacrorum antistitum* goes on to say that the profession of faith shall be that prescribed by Pope Pius IV, together with the additions, relative to the First Vatican Council, prescribed by the

[9] *Codicis iuris canonici fontes,* III, 782. [10] *Ibid.*

Decree of Jan. 20, 1877. And it likewise indicates the Church officials other than professors in seminaries who are bound by law to take the Oath.

Actually, then, in the immediate context of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* the command that seminary professors take Oath against Modernism stands out as one of four orders directed towards the prevention of the entrance of Modernism into ecclesiastical seminaries. These four directives are: (1) the strict carrying out of the legislation set down under n. 2 of the first section of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* (2) the submission by individual seminary professors to their Bishops at the beginning of the scholastic year of the textbooks they are going to use and of the theses they are going to propound, (3) the investigation (obviously by the competent and proper ecclesiastical authority), of the teaching offered in the various courses being given to the seminarians, and finally (4) the making of the Tridentine-Vatican profession of faith and the taking of the Oath against Modernism. The teacher is to sign his name to the Oath he has taken. The context would seem to indicate that it was the mind of St. Pius X that this Oath should be taken every year at the beginning of the academic term.

All of the other operations, including the taking of the Oath against Modernism, are subordinated to a certain extent to the legislation set down in the second sub-section of the first part of the *Sacrorum antistitum.* This sub-section, it must be remembered, is part of the text of the *Sacrorum antistitum* which is simply reproduced from the disciplinary portion of the *Pascendi dominici gregis.* The pertinent sub-section follows:

> All these prescriptions, both Our own and those of Our predecessor, are to be kept in view whenever there is a question of choosing directors and teachers for seminaries and for Catholic universities. Anyone who in any way is found to be tainted with Modernism is to be excluded without compunction from these offices, whether of administration or of teaching, and those who already occupy such offices are to be removed. The same policy is to be followed with regard to those who openly or secretly lend support to Modernism, either by praising the Modernists and excusing their culpable conduct, or by carping at scholasticism, and the Fathers, and the *magisterium* of the Church, or by refusing obedience to ecclesiastical authority in any of its depositaries; and with regard to those who manifest a love of novelty in history, archeology, and biblical exegesis; and finally with regard to

those who neglect the sacred sciences or appear to prefer the secular [sciences] to them. On this entire subject, Venerable Brethren, and especially with regard to the choice of teachers, you cannot be too watchful or too careful, for as a rule the students are modelled according to the pattern of their teachers. Strong in the consciousness of your duty, act always in this matter with prudence and with vigor.

Equal diligence and severity are to be used in examining and selecting candidates for Holy Orders. Far, far from the clergy be the love of novelty! God hates the proud and the obstinate mind. In the future the doctorate in theology or in canon law must never be conferred on anyone who has not first of all made the regular course in scholastic philosophy. If such a doctorate be conferred, it is to be held as null and void. The rules laid down in 1896 by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars for the clerics of Italy, both secular and regular, about the frequenting of universities, We now decree to be extended to all nations. Clerics and priests inscribed in a Catholic institute or university must not in the future follow in civil universities those courses for which there are chairs in the Catholic institutes to which they belong. If this has been permitted anywhere in the past, We order that it shall not be allowed in the future. Let the Bishops who form the governing boards of such institutes or universities see to it with all care that these Our commands be constantly observed.[11]

There can be no doubt whatsoever about the severity of the directives which are, in the text of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* immediately associated with the command that teachers in seminaries and in the ecclesiastical schools of Catholic universities take the Oath against Modernism, which appeared for the first time in that document. St. Pius X ordered that those who taught the errors condemned in the *Lamentabili sane exitu* and in the *Pascendi dominici gregis* should be dropped from any position on the administrative or on the teaching staff of any seminary or Catholic university, and that men who held such views must not, under any conditions whatsoever, be considered as prospects for membership in the administrations or in the professional corps of such institutions. Furthermore he ordered that the sympathizers with Modernism should be treated in exactly the same fashion. It is quite obvious that, in speaking of lovers of "novelties," the saintly Pontiff meant people who favored these propositions condemned by the Church and designated as Modernism.

[11] *Ibid.,* III, 776.

Then there were other directives. It was decreed that the doctorate in sacred theology and in canon law must never, in the future, be conferred on any person who had not taken a regular course in scholastic philosophy. Furthermore, St. Pius X ordered that priests connected with Catholic institutions of higher learning must not, in the future, take in non-Catholic institutions of higher studies courses which were being given in the schools with which they themselves were connected.

All of these directives went against the liberal Catholic spirit, of which Modernism was the outstanding expression. All of them were likewise unpopular, as calculated to arouse the antagonism of the enemies who attacked the Church from the outside. All of them were duly denounced and regretted as obscurantist. Catholics of mediocre intellectual attainments attracted praise to themselves for their disloyalty to Our Lord's cause and to His Church which was manifested in their disdainful reactions against these commands of Christ's Vicar on earth. Yet certainly and incontrovertibly the cause of Christ, the cause of truth, the cause of the Catholic faith, benefited to the extent that these rigorous directives were carried out.

It must definitely be understood that the most rigorous and the most important of these directives set forth in the disciplinary part of the *Pascendi dominici gregis,* and afterwards in the *Sacrorum antistitum,* are expressions of what we may call the natural law of the supernatural order. In other words, the obligation of the individual Bishop to exclude Modernists and sympathizers with Modernism from the administrations and from the professorial staffs of seminaries and of Catholic universities definitely did not begin with the first promulgation of this law by St. Pius X. Given the position and the obligation of the Bishop within the true Church of Jesus Christ, and given the nature and the necessity of the Catholic faith, it is always the clear duty of the Bishop to exclude from the dignity of teaching in the Church in any position under his control any individual who will teach or favor the contradiction of the divinely revealed message. Modernism was and is such a contradiction. Thus it was and always will necessarily remain the duty of the Bishop to see to it that any individual who teaches or who supports Modernism in any way be excluded from any co-operation in the apostolic task of teaching the divine message of Jesus Christ within His Church.

In issuing this decree, St. Pius X was taking cognizance of the basic truth about the teaching work in the Church which was afterwards brought out so clearly by Pope Pius XII in his allocution *Si diligis*. This document brings out more clearly than any other in recent years the tremendous responsibility of the Bishop in the field of teaching the divine message.

Christ Our Lord entrusted the truth which He had brought from heaven to the Apostles, and through them to their successors. He sent His Apostles as He had been sent by the Father (*John*, 20:21), to teach all nations everything they had heard from Him (cf. *Matt.*, 28:19 f.). The Apostles are, therefore, by divine right the true doctors and teachers in the Church. Besides the lawful successors of the Apostles, namely the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church and the Bishops for the faithful entrusted to their care (cf. can. 1326), there are no other teachers divinely constituted in the Church of Christ. But both the Bishops and, first of all, the Supreme Teacher and Vicar of Christ on earth, may associate others with themselves in their work as teacher, and may use their advice. They delegate to them the faculty to teach, either by special grant, or by conferring an office to which this faculty is attached (cf. can. 1328). Those who are so called teach, not in their own name, nor by reason of their theological knowledge, but by reason of the mandate they have received from the lawful Teaching Authority. Their faculty always remains subject to that Authority, nor is it ever exercised in its own right or independently. Bishops, for their part, by conferring this faculty, are not deprived of the right to teach. They retain the very grave obligation of supervising the doctrine which others propose, in order to help them and of seeing to its integrity and security. Therefore the legitimate Teaching Authority of the Church is guilty of no injury or no offence to any of those to whom it has given a canonical mission, if it desires to ascertain what they, to whom it has entrusted the mission of teaching, are proposing and defending in their lectures, in books, notes, and reviews intended for the use of their students, as well as in books and other publications intended for the general public.[12]

In the *Si diligis*, Pope Pius XII explains the directives issued by St. Pius X in the *Pascendi* and in the *Sacrorum antistitum*. The members of the apostolic hierarchy of jurisdiction, the Pope and the residential Bishops throughout the world are responsible before

[12] The text and translation of the *Si diligis* are in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXX, 2 (Aug., 1954), 127-37. This passage is found on pp. 133 f.

God Himself for the teaching in the Catholic Church. All the legitimate teaching in the Church is issued by them or under their direction. They have full responsibility and full competence to see to it that the faithful of Christ receive His message in all of its purity and integrity. Naturally if they themselves contradict, or transform, or withhold any portion of the revealed truth which has been entrusted to them, they will have been recreant to the commission they have received from Our Lord Himself. And, in precisely the same way, they are being disloyal to Our Lord if they allow those whom they use as helpers in the teaching work within the Church to deny or to adulterate any of the divinely revealed doctrines.

The power and the dignity of the apostolic Catholic hierarchy in the field of dogmatic teaching are beyond comparison. But with that dignity and with that authority goes the gravest responsibility which human beings are called upon to assume. The directives which, in the *Sacrorum antistitum,* form the immediate context of the command to take the Oath against Modernism, simply take cognizance of these basic and most important facts.

In the final analysis, they are founded upon an awareness of the tremendous and vital necessity of the divine faith itself. St. Pius X directed that all professors or directors of seminaries and of Catholic universities who taught or showed sympathy with the doctrines condemned as Modernism should be removed from their positions, and commanded that such individuals should not be brought into such positions in the future. This order, as is quite obvious, is simply a statement of what is actually required by the constitution of the Catholic Church itself. The same obligation would have been incumbent on the Bishops of the Catholic Church even if St. Pius X had not spoken out and issued these directives.

The *Sacrorum antistitum,* however, goes even further. It demands that the individual teachers in seminaries and in Catholic universities submit to their Bishops the name of the textbook they intend to follow or the list of theses they intend to teach and defend in their academic lectures. Furthermore it insists that the Bishops themselves take care, during the course of the academic year, to find out exactly what is being taught in the various classes in the Catholic institutes of higher learning under their direction. And then, in order to bring out this obligation for doctrinal

orthodoxy in the clearest possible way, the *Sacrorum antistitum* orders these teachers to make the Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent and of the First Vatican Council, and to take and sign their names to the special Oath composed by St. Pius X precisely to repudiate and to condemn the central teachings of the Modernist movement.

With this salutary severity with reference to the teachers and directors of ecclesiastical seminaries and of Catholic universities, the *Sacrorum antistitum* likewise contains strict directives about the candidates for Holy Orders. Men who hold Modernistic teachings or who are sympathetic towards the Modernists are not to be ordained. With his intense awareness of the pastoral mission of the Catholic priesthood, St. Pius X was all too cognizant of the harm that could and inevitably would come to the Catholic Church from a priest who would be willing to pervert his position by working against the divinely revealed teaching of Jesus Christ.

THE OATH ITSELF

Against the background of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* then, the Oath against Modernism appears as something intended primarily for teachers in and directors of ecclesiastical seminaries and Catholic universities. Other dignitaries of the Catholic Church are ordered to take this Oath, along with the Tridentine Profession of the Faith. But it is something intended primarily and immediately for those who are called upon to teach or to direct candidates for Holy Orders.

Thus the Oath itself is constituted as a Profession of the Catholic belief. The man who takes this Oath makes his solemn declaration in the sight of God Himself that he firmly accepts and receives all the teachings and each individual one of the teachings "that have been defined, asserted, and declared by the infallible *magisterium* of the Church, especially those points of doctrine which are directly opposed to the errors of this time."[13] The most important and influential of these "errors of this time" are clearly pointed out in the formula, and the man who takes the Oath calls upon God as His Witness that he rejects these false judgments and firmly accepts the statements of Catholic doctrine opposed to them. St. Pius X ordered that the professors and administrators in seminaries

[13] *Denz.,* n. 2145.

and in Catholic universities sign their names to the formula of the Oath after they had taken it. Thus it would be difficult to find or even to conceive of a more effective measure for the protection of candidates for Holy Orders from the infection of Modernism than that constituted by St. Pius X in his legislation about the Oath in the *Sacrorum antistitum.* The man who taught or in any way aided in the dissemination or the protection of Modernistic teachings in a seminary or in a Catholic university after the issuance of the *Sacrorum antistitum* would mark himself, not only as a sinner against the Catholic faith, but also as a common perjuror.

Incidentally, the Oath against Modernism contained in the *Sacrorum antistitum* is something which demands a certain amount of knowledge in the man who takes it seriously and religiously. We must not allow ourselves to forget that essentially an oath is an act of religion, an act in which we worship almighty God or manifest our acknowledgement of His supreme excellence and of our own complete and absolute dependence upon Him.[14] Thus an oath is definitely not something that can be taken lightly. And the man who takes the Oath against Modernism calls upon God to witness that he reverently submits and whole-heartedly assents "to all the condemnations, the declarations, and the commands which are contained in the encyclical *Pascendi* and in the decree *Lamentabili,* especially to those that relate to what they call the history of dogmas."[15] It would seem to be irreverent indeed for any seminary or university professor to take this oath without knowing exactly what is condemned, what is taught, and what is commanded in these two tremendously important documents. It is quite obvious that some of the doctrines and directives contained in the *Pascendi* and in the *Lamentabili* are also brought out in the Oath against Modernism. But it is equally clear that not all of these teachings and precepts of the two 1907 documents are set forth in the Oath, and that the man who wishes to take the Oath as a religious act, to take it worthily, must exert himself to find out exactly and in detail what he is promising to accept and to believe. And it is patent that the man who does not take the time and the trouble to find out what is taught and what is commanded in the *Pascendi* and in the *Lamentabili* is being somewhat careless in calling upon the living

[14] Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* IIa-IIae, q. 89, a. 4.
[15] *Denz.,* n. 2146.

God to witness that he will whole-heartedly abide by the doctrines and the directives contained in these two statements.

RECAPITULATION

The Oath against Modernism is undoubtedly, up until now, the most important and the most influential document issued by the Holy See during the course of the twentieth century. It is a magnificent statement of Catholic truth, in the face of the errors which were being disseminated within the Church by the cleverest enemies the Mystical Body of Christ has encountered in the course of its history. It was a profession of Catholic belief intended primarily for those engaged in the spiritual and intellectual formation of candidates for Holy Orders. According to the strict command of the *Sacrorum antistitum,* the men for whom the Oath against Modernism was primarily intended were also obliged to show their Bishops, at the beginning of each academic year, the textbooks they were employing in class, and the theses they intended to teach and to defend. The Bishops themselves were not only reminded of their obligation, but were strictly commanded to watch over the teaching being given in the institutions of higher learning under their direction and control.

The Bishops were also commanded to see to it that no man tainted with Modernism, either as a teacher of the errors condemned in the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi,* or as one who supported these errors by working to discredit the teachers of Catholic truth who opposed and unmasked Modernism, was to be admitted to or permitted to remain in the professorial corps or the administration of an ecclesiastical seminary or a Catholic university. And no young man who was infected by Modernism errors was to be allowed to become or to remain a candidate for Holy Orders.

This was the rigorous and powerful direction of the *Sacrorum antistitum.* Quite obviously it was not and it still is not in accord with the tastes of liberal Catholics. But it was and it remains the great expression of St. Pius X's desire to accomplish his mission as Christ's Vicar on earth. It was and it remains a tremendously effective factor for the protection of the little ones of Jesus Christ against the virus of Modernism.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

HUIOTHESIA: THE ADOPTIVE SONSHIP OF THE ISRAELITES

Chapter IX of the *Epistle to the Romans* begins with an introductory section (vss. 1-5) in which St. Paul expresses his great reverence and love for the Jewish people. This introduction has the nature of a "captatio benevolentiae"[1] and among other things mentions *huiothesia* as one of the prerogatives of the Israelites. The text of this introduction is as follows:

> I speak the truth in Christ, I do not lie, my conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sadness and continuous sorrow in my heart. For I could wish to be anathema myself from Christ for the sake of my brethren, who are my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites, *who have the adoption as sons,* and the glory and the covenants and the legislation and the worship and the promises; who have the fathers, and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh, who is over all things, God blessed forever, amen.[2]

The original Greek for the phrase "adoption as sons" is *huiothesia.* This word occurs in the New Testament only, is used by St. Paul alone, and is employed by him a mere four (possibly five) times as a suitable expression of the intimate relationship between God and man that is inaugurated by sanctifying grace. These five times are in *Rom.* 8:15.23; 9:4; *Gal.* 4:6; *Eph.* 1:6. Of these the usage in *Rom.* 9:4 is of special interest because of its patent reference to the Old Testament dispensation of salvation.

The first thing to note about *huiothesia* here is that it occurs in a context which lists the prerogatives of the Israelites precisely as members of the Old Covenant and separated from the Gospel which the Apostle is preaching. All other times it is used of *Christians,* whether of Jewish or Gentile origin; but here it is referred to the Israelites precisely as Israelites. Furthermore, the word is accompained by the definite article *hē huiothesia,* thus showing that the

[1] A. Theissen, *The Epistle to the Romans* (in A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, New York: Nelson, 1953), p. 1068.

[2] Unless noted otherwise, all Scriptural citations in English are taken from the American version published by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, St. Anthony Guild Press: Paterson, New Jersey.

writer had a specific and determined object in mind.[3] The question is: What does St. Paul have in mind when he lists *huiothesia* as one, even the first (not counting their glorious name *Israelitai*) among the privileges of the Israelites?

Etymologically *huiothesia* is derived from a combination of *huios* and *thesthai*. Its origin and meaning is best explained by comparing it with another of the prerogatives mentioned in verses 4 and 5 which is similar in form and usage: *nomothesia*.

The latter is also a compound word derived from *nomos* and *thesthai* and is defined by Zorell in his *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti* as "legislatio . . . *ē nomothesia* . . . legislatio Mosis (R 9,4; 2 Macc 6,23)."[4] Here it should be noted that Zorell gives the term a double meaning, one subjective and active; the other objective and passive. The same twofold meaning is admitted by other lexicographers, e.g., Liddell-Scott;[5] and Stephan.[6] The Latin word *legislatio* itself has the same double signification. The same is true for our English word *legislation;* which is derived directly from the Latin. Thus *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* defines the term: "Act of legislating; preparation and enactment of laws. Also, the laws that are so enacted."[7]

It will be very much to our purpose, therefore, to see what *nomothesia* means in the context of *Rom.* 9:4. A quick survey of a representative number of the standard commentaries shows that a good number of them hold that *nomothesia* is to be taken in the secondary meaning of the Law as such. This is the opinion, for instance, of Cornely,[8] and Theissen,[9] who simply note that here

[3] M. Zerwick, *Graecitas Biblica exemplis illustratur* (ed. aucta et emendata, Romae: P.I.B., 1955), n. 122, "It is the character of the article (which was originally a demonstrative pronoun) to specify, to set off, to stress something as having this nature (and not that). The article, therefore, always shows us that the author had something specific in mind. The manner, however, in which the thing was specified for the author is rarely apparent to us, though at times this would be of great help exegetically."

[4] Ed. altera, Paris: Lethielleux, 1931, col. 879 f.

[5] *A Greek-English Dictionary* (new edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 1180.

[6] *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Paris: Didot, 1829), col. 1549.

[7] 5th ed., Springfield, G. and C. Merriam Co., 1942, *sub voce.*

[8] R. Cornely, *Epistola ad Romanos* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1927), p. 474.

[9] A. Theissen, *The Epistle to the Romans* (in a Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture), p. 1068.

there is question of the Law of Moses or the Pentateuch. Fritzsche[10] shares the same opinion, though he takes cognizance of the possibility that the term might refer to the legislative *act* rather than to the resulting legislation. Lagrange,[11] Huby,[12] and Lyonnet[13] probably also understand *nomothesia* objectively of the Law. Unfortunately their commentary is very brief, and not too explicit. An equal number of exegetes, on the other hand, explicitly stress the active character of the word and define it as "the *giving* of the Law on Sinai,[14] that is, "die Gesetzgebung: *mattan Thorah.*"[15]

[10] C. F. A. Fritzsche, *Pauli ad Romanos epistola* (2 vols., Halis: Gebauer, 1836-9), II, 256, ". . . the word, like its German equivalent 'Gesetzgebung,' has a double signification: I. the making, the enacting of a law . . . , II. the body of law which is enacted. . . . In the passage under consideration the second signification predominates, so that the term denotes *all* the laws of God, which were promulgated through the instrumentality of Moses, and which both constituted the Israelites into a civil entity and regulated their religious activities."

[11] M. J. Lagrange, *Epître aux Romains* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1916), p. 226: "the holy legislation which was inaugurated by God. Paul, looking at it as a whole, reckoned it as among the great privileges of Israel, particularly since it regulated worship *(latria)*, the only cult which in antiquity was rendered to the true God."

[12] J. Huby, *Saint Paul. Epître aux Romains* (11me ed., in *Verbum Salutis*, Vol. X; Paris: Beauschesne, 1940), p. 325; "the *legislation* enacted by God (*Ex.* 20, 1 ff.) for the moral conduct of Israel."

[13] S. Lyonnet, *Quaestiones in Epistolam ad Romanos* (secunda series), p. 20: *"legislation:* in so far as it manifested the will of God and regulated the whole moral order (cf. *Ex.* 20, 1 ff. the law of holiness, the decalogue, etc.)." According to *Rom.* 2,20 the Jews had "in the Law the pattern of knowledge and of truth."

[14] R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1951), p. 585.

[15] J. Sickenberger, *Die Briefe des heiligen Paulus an die Korinthier und Römer* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1932), p. 248: *"legislation.* God honored them with the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai, which was later enlarged into the full Law of the Old Covenant." H. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midraschim,* III: Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis, erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch (München, Beck, 1926), p. 262: *"ἡ nomothesia,* the giving of the Law—*mattan torah."* B. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1899), p. 395: "Cpr. II Macch 6, 23, the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai, . . . The gentiles also had a law, but the solemn promulgation was the mark by which God had singled out the Israelites from all the nations." T. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig, 1910), p. 433: "Alluding to the Sinaitic Covenant Paul refers to the particular aspect

The most detailed explanation of the meaning and the import of *nomothesia,* however, is given by Cerfaux,[16] who stresses the point that Israel had God himself as her legislator, and that consequently her constitution is divine. He holds that St. Paul deliberately chose the word *nomothesia* here in preference to *nomos,* because in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians "law" signifies rather the *religious system* which the Pharisees had erected on the divine "legislation." By their theories of human merit, and of works producing justice, they had deformed the divine plan and erected a precarious structure of their own. In St. Paul's view the legislation which God had given to the Israelites was not so much a system of works and merits, but rather an expression of the divine wisdom, a teacher, a mode of spiritual life, a path to God, a guide along the way, in short "the pattern of knowledge and truth" (cf. *Rom.* 2:17-30).

Hē nomothesia is therefore something objective. It connotes primarily a divine *act* and remains good and holy, even though the individual misinterprets it and does not live accordingly. As a matter of fact, Cerfaux considers all the privileges listed in *Rom.* 9:4;5 as having an objective character and as being constitutive elements of the "charter," the religious constitution of the "community *(politeia)*" of Israel (*Eph.* 2:12).[17] This "charter" was

---

which is its characteristic mark, namely, the giving of the Law, and the consequent regulation of cult for all time."

[16] L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), p. 36 f.: "*Legislation.* Israel's lawgiver was God Himself, and its constitution as a nation was something divine. Paul prefers the word more often used in juridicial contexts, 'legislation,' to 'law.' In Romans and Galatians, 'the law' means the religious system that the Pharisees built up on legislation, thus deforming the divine plan with a theory of justice and merit through works. . . . Paul's divine legislation is also wisdom, education, *ascesis;* it is the formulation of religious knowledge (knowledge of the truth); see *Rom.* 2, 17-20. Admittedly, this eulogy is put into the mouth of a Jew, but there is no reason why Paul should not appreciate the God-given legislation as a Jew. One might even say that he appreciates it as a Hellenistic Jew, to go by his expressions in *Rom.* 2. The Law gives knowledge of the true and living God. It reveals a moral teaching that the pagans had forgotten. To judge the Law in such a favorable light, one has obviously to dissociate the legislation (which is something divine) from the human religious system that the doctors of the Law had built upon it."

[17] *Idem.* "Le Privilege d'Israel selon saint Paul" in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses,* 17 (1940), 12: "The Charter of Israel. By the word charter we wish to translate the word *politeia* which Paul uses in *Eph.* 2, 12

really an ensemble of the prerogatives which God had given to his Chosen People. The privilege of Israel consisted essentially in being entrusted with the mission of awaiting and preparing the way for the heir that was promised to Abraham. All the prerogatives of Israel were therefore temporal, being directed to Christ.[18]

How does all this apply to *huiothesia?* How does this help determine the meaning of *huiothesia* in *Rom.* 9:4? From what has been shown above concerning the word *nomothesia* we saw that both words are similar in form; both are written with the definite article. Since *nomothesia* has a twofold signification, denoting primarily the law-giving as an action, but secondarily also the Law itself as a result of this action, it is not presumptuous to assume that *huiothesia* likewise has a twofold signification, denoting in the first place the divine action, the act whereby God makes the Israelites His sons, but at the same time also the result of this action, the *state* of adoptive sonship of the Israelites. It is most probable that St. Paul deliberately willed the word to be understood in its twofold sense; that he intended placing the emphasis on the primary or subjective signification, without, however, omitting the secondary or objective one.[19]

The objective aspect also seems to be stressed by the total complex of the list of the eight prerogatives which form so many precious jewels in the crown suggested by the very name *Israelitai.* All of them are objective gifts, given by God to his people, which cannot be dimmed or destroyed even if the individual Israelite, the physical descendant of Abraham, does not personally share in these privileges. There is a world of difference between these prerogatives in their objective aspect as they come from God, and in their subjective aspect as they are found within the individual Jews.

---

to designate the religious constitution of Israel, which is based above all on the 'covenant' and the 'promise' and includes the knowledge of the true God. The Charter, therefore, includes the ensemble of privileges which are enumerated in greater detail by the Apostle in *Rom.* 9, 4."

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 26. "The privilege of Israel, therefore, consisted basically in having been given the mission of awaiting the heir who was promised to Abraham. . . . All the privileges of Israel were essentially temporary and transient, since they were directed toward Christ 'for Christ is the consummation of the Law' (*Rom.* 10, 4)."

[19] A. Merk, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine,* p. 530. E. Nestle, *Greek New Testament* (New York: American Bible Society, 1936), p. 409. L. Gramatica, *Bibliorum Sacrorum juxta Vulgatam Clementinam* (nova editio, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1951), p. 1064.

We have already stated that St. Paul is speaking of Jews, fellow Israelites, precisely in so far as they are *not* Christians. Yet theirs also was the *huiothesia,* and the glory, and the covenants and the *nomothesia,* etc. Hence *huiothesia* here seems to refer chiefly to an *external* and *objective* privilege rather than to an internal status. As an external privilege it belonged to the Nation as a whole, and all the Jews shared in it as physical descendants of Abraham. Some among them also corresponded with an *internal* disposition of soul, and so became sons of God in fact, the *true* seed of Abraham (*Rom.* 4; *Gal.* 3:7-18); but by far the greater number of them did not, and this fills the soul of the Apostle with grief and anguish (*Rom.* 9:2).[20]

The next question is: how does St. Paul apply this *huiothesia* with its full connotation to the Israelites? What is he referring to? The various editions of the Scriptures and also most commentaries are almost uniform in having marginal or footnote references to such texts as *Ex.* 4:22; 19:5; *Deut.* 7:6; 14:1 ff.; 32:6; *Jer.* 31:9.20; *Os.* 1:10 and 11:1. What do these texts teach us about the status of Israel?

The first reference noted is *Ex.* 4:22 ff., which says: "So you shall say to Pharao: Thus says the Lord: Israel is my son, my first-born. Hence I tell you: Let my son go, that he may serve me. If you refuse to let him go, I warn you, I will kill your son, your first-born." This is the earliest notice we have of the intimacy and care with which God regarded his people. It is worth calling attention to the word "Israel" here. It is singular, and thus refers to the nation as a whole. Divine sonship therefore belongs to the people *as a whole,* rather than to the singular members, and God's predilection is for the nation as such. Israel as a whole has been elected by God.[21] They are to be his special possession: "Therefore, if you hearken to my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my special possession, dearer to me than all other people, though all the earth

[20] R. Cornely, *Commentarium in Epistolam ad Romanos* (CSS), p. 475. C. F. Fritzsche, *Pauli ad Romanos Epistola,* p. 256. M. J. Lagrange, *Epitre aux Romains,* p. 226. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* p. 585. Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans* (ICC), p. 230. B. Weiss, *Der Brief an die Römer,* p. 395.

[21] J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *The Book of Exodus,* Introduction and Exegesis, (in *The Interpreter's Bible,* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954), I, 882.

is mine. You shall be to me a kingdom of priests, a holy nation" (*Ex.* 19:5).

What does this being constituted as God's son entail, being his special possession? In the first place, because Israel is God's son, God loves him dearly, even as a man has a special love for his first-born son. The book of Deuteronomy gives further indication of the full implication of the father-son relationship which God has established between himself and Israel. Thus *Deut.* 7:8 explains:

> It was because the Lord loved you and because of his fidelity to the oath he had sworn to your fathers, that he brought you out with his strong hand from the place of slavery and ransomed you from the hand of Pharao, king of Egypt.

Here, as in *Ex.* 4:22, is stressed God's love for His people. This is the sole reason for their privilege.

Furthermore, because Israel is God's son, he cannot be kept as a slave by another nation, but must be free, so that he can serve his Father as he ought—because Israel is God's son, he is a "people sacred to the Lord," God's "chosen people." Hence Deuteronomy continues: "You are children of the Lord, your God. You shall not gash yourselves nor shave the hair above your foreheads for the dead. For you are a people sacred to the Lord, your God, who has chosen you from all the nations on the face of the earth to be a people peculiarly his own." (*Deut.* 14:1 ff.)

God's relationship to Israel, and especially the latter's relationship toward God, the reverence Israel should have toward the Lord as Father is even more expressly stated in *Deut.* 32:5 ff.: "Yet basely has he been treated by his degenerate children, a perverse and crooked race! Is the Lord to be thus repaid by you, O stupid and foolish people? Is not he your father who created you? Has he not made you and established you?" This reference is probably also to their liberation from Egyptian serfdom and to the Exodus from Egypt, which was really Israel's birth as a nation, and is closely related with its status of sonship.[22] The same father-son relationship between Jahve and Israel is also found in *Is.* 64:8 ff., and *Mal.* 2:10.

The fact already insinuated in *Ex.* 4:22 and *Deut.* 7:8 that it was God's love alone which made him choose Israel as his special

[22] D. J. Theron, "Adoption in the Pauline Corpus," in *Evangelical Quarterly*, 28 (1956), 7.

people and not any merit on their part is expressed even more emphatically in the writings of the Prophets. Thus in the beginning of Isaias we read:

> Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken. I have brought up children, and exalted them: but they have despised me . . . Surely, they are my people, children that will not deny: so he became their savior. In all their affliction he was not troubled, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love, and in his mercy he redeemed them, and he carried them and lifted them up all the days of old. (*Is.* 1:2; 63:8 ff.) [23]

Osee is yet more explicit when he says: "And I was like a foster-father to Ephraim, I carried them in my arms, and they knew not that I healed them." (*Is.* 11:3.)[24] Jeremias, however, is the clearest of all in underlining the element of love in the father-son relationship between God and Israel. In Jeremias we read such striking passages as: "But I said; How shall I put thee among the children, and give thee a lovely land, the goodly inheritance of the armies of the Gentiles? And I said: Thou shalt call me father and shalt not cease to walk after me." (*Jer.* 3:19.)[25]

God's love for Israel, however, and the favors He grants him carry with them an ulterior purpose. Because Israel is God's son, he also has special obligations toward the Lord. God wants His son to serve Him (*Ex.* 4:23), to keep the covenant (*Ex.* 19:5), and to behave as a son by keeping the commandments: "Therefore, keep the commandment of the Lord, your God, by walking in his ways and fearing him." (*Deut.* 8:6.)

Later, when Israel forgets his obligations to the Lord, Jahve complains bitterly through the mouth of Isaias:

> Hear, O ye heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken. I have brought up children and exalted them: but they have despised me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel hath not known me, and my people hath not understood. Woe to the sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a wicked seed, ungracious children; they have forsaken the Lord, they have blasphemed the Holy One of Israel, they are gone away backwards. (*Is.* 1:2-4.)[26]

Jahve repeats his plaint through the mouth of Jeremias: "For my foolish people have not known me; they are foolish and senseless

[23] Douay-Rheims version.
[24] *Ibid.*
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid.*

children: they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge." (*Jer.* 4:22.) He even goes so far as to compare Israel to a faithless wife: "But as a woman that despiseth her lover, so hath the house of Israel despised me, saith the Lord." (*Jer.* 3:20).[27] The theme of infidelity is the underlying metaphor in the book of Osee.

In all these passages it is to be noted that there is question of Israel as a whole, of Israel as a people, as a nation, and not of the individual members who constituted the people. In time, however, a distinction is gradually introduced between the members themselves of the nation. Thus we note how the pious are contrasted with the impious in *Ps.* 72:15: "Had I thought, 'I will speak as they do,' I had been false to the fellowship of your children"; and how the Lord loves those who fear him, in *Ps.* 103:13: "As a father has compassion on his children, so the Lord has compassion on those who fear him."

It is only later, and especially in the sapiential books, that the individual is called a son of the Most High: "To the fatherless be as a father, and help their mother as a husband would; Thus will you be like a son to the Most High, and he will be more tender to you than a mother" (*Sir.* 4:10 ff.); and that an individual considers himself a son of God and appeals to God as his Father: "Lord, Father and Master of my life, permit me not to fall by them; . . . Lord, Father, and God of my life, abandon me not to their control" (*Sir.* 23:1.4); so also in the book of Judith the individual is represented as calling upon God for aid: "O Lord God of my father Simeon: . . . assist, I beseech thee, O Lord God, me a widow." (*Judith* 9:2-4).[28] Nonetheless, at the same time the people as a whole is also called God's son: "Show mercy to the people called by your name; Israel, whom you named your first-born" (*Sir.* 36:11), and the people as a whole remind Jahve of his promises and call on him for mercy and help: "Give evidence of your deeds of old; fulfill the prophecies spoken in your name . . . Hear the prayer of your servants for you are ever gracious to your people." (*Sir.* 36:14.16.)

In like manner in the Book of Wisdom, the people as a whole are called son of God: "For though they disbelieved at every turn on account of their sorceries, at the destruction of the first-born,

[27] *Ibid.* [28] *Ibid.*

they acknowledged that the people was God's son" (*Wis.* 18:13); likewise in *Wis.* 9:7 and 11:10. But here again, the individual is taunted by the impious as considering himself the son of God:

> . . . He calls blest the destiny of the just and boasts that God is his Father. Let us see whether his words be true, let us find out what will happen to him. For if the just one be the son of God, he will defend him and deliver him from the hand of his foes (*Wis.* 2:16-18).

In his turn, the pious individual prays to God as his Father and praises his providence: "For the urge for profits devised this latter, and Wisdom the artificer constructed it; but your providence, O Father! guides it." (*Wis.* 14:3.)

The phenomenon which we have just been tracing in the later canonical books of the Old Testament—namely, that alongside the corporate position and privileges of Israel as a whole the individual also feels that he *personally* shares these privileges, that he is a son of God, and that he may therefore address God as his Father—is also found in the uncanonical or apocryphal books of the Old Testament.[29]

In these apocryphal books Israel as a whole is still dominantly the subject of God's election, the object of his love and promises. Thus we read in the *Book of Jubilees* (*c.* 150 B.C.):

> And their souls will cleave to Me and all My commandments, and they will fulfill My commandments, and I will be their Father and they will be My children. And they will all be called children of the living God, and every angel and every spirit will know, yea, they will know that these are My children, and that I am their Father in uprightness and righteousness, and that I love them (*Jub.* 1:24 ff.). . . . And I have chosen the seed of Jacob from amongst all that I have seen, and have written him down as My first-born son, and have sanctified him unto Myself for ever and ever; and I will teach them the Sabbath day, that they may keep Sabbath thereon from all work (*Jub.* 2:20).[30]

---

[29] The data on this apocryphal literature is taken from J. E. Steinmueller, *A Companion to Scripture Study*, I, 105. For more complete data, see R. H. Charles, *"The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913). The references to these apocryphal texts and their evaluation are taken from H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, etc., vol. III, p. 16, n. 2 *a* and *b*.

[30] R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees* or the Little Genesis. Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic text and edited with introduction, notes and indices (London: Black, 1902), pp. 7 and 17.

The same love, election, and protection is expressed in the *Psalms of Solomon* (80-40 B.C.):

> He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth; At his rebuke nations shall flee before him, And he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their heart. And he shall gather together a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness, And he shall judge the tribes of the people that has been sanctified by the Lord his God (*Sol.* 17:25 ff.). . . . And thy love [is] toward the seed of Abraham, the children of Israel, Thy chastisement is upon us as [upon] a first-born, only begotten son (*Sol.* 18:4).[31]

So also in *The Assumption of Moses* (*c.* 7 A.D.): "For the Heavenly One will rise from His royal throne, and He will go forth from His holy habitation, And his wrath will burn on account of His sons." (*Moses* 10:3.)[32] The same appellations and solicitude are expressed in *4 Esdras* (*c.* end of first century after Christ): "But we thy people, whom thou hast called thy firstborn, thy only begotten, thy fervent lover, are given into their hands." (*4 Esd.* 6:58.)[33]

Yet in the midst of this traditional view of Israel as a nation as the object of God's choice and favors, we also find dispersed here and there in these same apocryphal books occasional references where the *individual just man* is considered as the object of this solicitude. So, for instance, in the *Book of Henoch* (175-164 B.C.) we read: "And He will deliver them [i.e., the kings and the mighty] to the angels for punishment, To execute vengeance on them because they have oppressed His children and elect." (*Henoch* 62:11.)[34] The same is found more specifically in the *Psalms of Solomon:* "For He correcteth the righteous as a beloved son, and His chastisement is that of a first-born. For the Lord spareth His pious ones, and blotteth out their errors by His chastening." (*Ps. Sol.* 13:9.)[35]

[31] R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English,* II, pp. 649 and 651.

[32] *Idem, The Assumption of Moses,* translated from the Latin Sixth Century Ms., etc. (London: Black, 1897), p. 4.

[33] W. O. E. Oesterly, *II Esdras* (The Esra Apocalypse), with Introduction and Notes (London: Methuen and Co., 1933), p. 125.

[34] R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* or I Enoch, translated from the editor's Ethiopic text, etc. . . . (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), p. 125.

[35] *Idem, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English,* II, 645.

St. Paul is in full accord with this traditional outlook on the character and privileges of Israel. He, too, uses the word "Israel" mostly in the very specific meaning of God's people. This is especially the case in *Rom.* IX-XI.[36] At the same time the usage of the word *Israelitai* in *Rom.* 9:4 is striking. The word signifies the individuals as members of the nation; and as members of the nation, they as individuals share the blessings which God has given to the nation as such. The Jews therefore (Paul's kinsmen by race) are Israelities, and as such really share in all the blessings and privileges which God had granted to Israel.

The Apostle does not explain the specific character nor internal nature of this adoptive sonship. He does not explicitly state whether this sonship is merely external and juridical, a fiction of the Law; or whether it brings with it an internal reality and is therefore internal and ontological. Yet he does give us some hints on his view of the matter.

These hints are to be found in Chapter XI of Romans where the Apostle illustrates the status of Jew and Gentile and their mutual relationship to God by the metaphor of a handful of dough and of the branches of a tree." (*Rom.* 11:16.) The implication in both is that there is an interior power in the one and in the other which transforms and lends its own character to the whole. The handful of dough which is holy acts as a leaven which lends its character to the whole mass. The root sends its life-giving sap through the trunk into the branches.

Not satisfied with a single metaphor for the second illustration, the Apostle continues by expanding it with an example taken from everyday life, in which the careful gardener grafts branches from one olive tree to another. St. Paul takes as a supposition that a branch from a wild olive tree is grafted onto a cultivated olive tree. The root of the cultivated olive tree then sends its lifegiving sap through the branch of the wild olive tree that was grafted onto it, so that this wild branch shares the richness of the cultivated olive tree and bears cultivated olives. The metaphor may perhaps be imaginary and contrary to the practice of actual husbandry,[37]

[36] W. Gutbrod, art. "*Israēl, Israēlitai*" in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch,* III, 389 f.

[37] J. Knox, *The Epistle to the Romans,* in *The Interpreter's Bible,* IX, 571, "Paul's meaning in the paragraph, vss. 17-24, is clearer than the figure

but its meaning is unmistakable. In each case the operative power is internal and the effect which is produced is ontological and affects the internal structure of the ensuing result.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this study may consequently be proposed as follows:

(1) The word *huiothesia* (like the word *nomothesia*) of itself denotes primarily an *action*. But an action has a result. The result of *nomothesia* is the Law, the result of *huiothesia* is adoptive sonship—in our case, adoptive *divine* sonship; each of the two terms denotes both action and result.

(2) God chose Israel from among all the peoples of the earth as specially his own, and made him His son. Through this election, Israel received a specific relationship to God and thereby became unique among the peoples of the earth. This election was prompted by God's great love and providential design, and was in no way due to any particular merit or dignity on the part of Israel.

(3) The individual Israelite shares in this privilege of sonship by his physical membership in the nation. As God's adopted son, he may confidently call on God as Father and appeal to His love and mercy, and hope to be heard by Him and to receive His blessing.

(4) Nonetheless, the individual Israelite must develop this external prerogative of belonging to Israel because of the accident of birth and genealogy by internalizing it and thereby becoming a truly adoptive son of God, otherwise he will not belong to the Israel of God (*Gal.* 6:16). Hence St. Paul concludes in *Rom.* 9:6: "For they are not all Israelites who are sprung from Israel; nor because they are the descendants of Abraham, are they all his children," and he adds in *Gal.* 3:7: "Know therefore that the men of faith are the real sons of Abraham."

MARTIN W. SCHOENBERG, O.S.C.

Crosier House of Studies
Fort Wayne, Indiana

---

he uses is accurate. At more than one point his ignorance of husbandry is disclosed; branches from a *wild* olive would not be grafted on a cultivated olive stock (if anything, the reverse would be done), and if they were, the grafted branches would not bear the fruit of the cultivated tree."

Answers to Questions

IMAGES IN WINDOWS

Question 1: Is it permissible to have a full window of some deceased person who is not beatified? The Founder of our Society is the one in question.

Answer 1: "Images of persons who died with a reputation for sanctity, but are not canonized or beatified, may not be put on altars; nor depicted away from altars with an aureole or other marks of sanctity. But their image, or incidents in their lives, may be portrayed on the walls or in stained glass, provided such images do not suggest any cult or display any special signs of sanctity, and have nothing profane about them or out of keeping with the usage of the Church (*S.R.C.* 3715, 3785, 3835)" (J. B. O'Connell, *Church Building and Furnishing* [London: Burns and Oates, 1955], p. 98).

Question 2: Is it permissible to have pictures of living persons, for example benefactors, somehow incorporated into stained glass windows as part of the window when the main theme is, for example the Immaculate Conception?

Answer 2: Although I find no specific reference in the various decrees to pictures of living persons in the stained glass windows of a church, the whole tenor of the legislation (including the decrees cited above) would seem to be opposed to such pictures. Prudence would likewise dictate their avoidance.

THE ROSARY IN THE EASTERN CHURCH

Question: I have heard that the rosary devotion among the Oriental Rites antedates that in the Latin Rite. What is the history of the rosary devotion in the Eastern Church?

Answer: The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XIII, *s.v.* Rosary tells us: "The custom of reciting prayers upon a string with knots or beads thereon at regular intervals has come down from the early

days of Christianity, and is still practised in the Eastern as well as in the Western Church. It seems to have originated among the early monks and hermits who used a heavy cord with knots tied at intervals upon which they recited their shorter prayers. This form of rosary is still used among monks in the various Greek Churches. . . . The first use of the rosary in any general way was among the monks of the Orient. . . . The intercourse of the Western peoples of the Latin Rite with those of the Eastern Rite at the beginning of the Crusades caused the practice of saying prayers upon knots or beads to become widely diffused among the monastic houses of the Latin Church, although the practice had been observed in some instances before that date. On the other hand, the recitation of the Rosary, as practised in the West, has not become general in the Eastern Churches; there it has still retained its original form as a monastic exercise of devotion, and is but little known or used among the laity, while even the secular clergy seldom use it in their devotions." In the section of the Code of Oriental Canon Law promulgated by the *Motu Proprio,* "Cleri Sanctitati," on June 11, 1957, and which took legal effect on March 25, 1958, we read in Canon 60, under "Obligations of Clerics": "The local Hierarchs shall see to it in regard to all clerics: . . . that they honor the Virgin Mother of God with prayers customary in the Church. . . ." A commentary on this canon reads: "The enumeration of practices of piety recommended to the clergy was changed so as to exclude those which are peculiar to the Latin Rite as far as their historical origin is concerned, e.g., the Marian rosary. . . ." (Victor J. Pospishil, *Code of Oriental Canon Law* [Ford City, Pa., 1960], pp. 64-65).

THE LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: What is the intention for the Leonine prayers after Low Mass? I have seen the following mentioned in various Catholic books and magazines: 1) For Russia; 2) for the conversion of Russia; 3) for the speedy relief of the persecuted Christians (i.e., all Christians) in Russia; 4) for the freedom of the Church in Russia; 5) for Russia, that God may soon give its people peace and religious liberty. If I can discover the precise intention, may I then announce this intention before starting the prayers, so that it will always be known by priests and people?

Answer: Pius XI, in an Allocution on June 30, 1930, said: "We must earnestly beseech Christ . . . the Redeemer of the human race to allow peace and the liberty of professing their faith to be restored to the afflicted sons of Russia; and it is Our will that the same prayers which Our predecessor of happy memory, Leo XIII, ordered priests to recite with the people after the completion of Mass, be said for this very intention, that is for Russia; and that Bishops and clergy, both religious and secular, be most careful to advise their people, or any who are present at Mass, of this intention, and frequently to remind them of it" (*A.A.S.*, 1930, p. 301). Pius XII, in an Apostolic Letter, addressed to all the people of Russia on July 7, 1952, made this intention his own when, after quoting the lines given above, he wrote: "This exhortation and command We readily repeat and confirm, since the conditions which religion is at present facing among you are surely no better, and since We are moved by the same strong feeling of affection and the same zealous solicitude for your people" (*A.A.S.*, 1952, p. 508). Although Pius XI, when he actually expressed his will regarding the recitation of the prayers, used the general phrase "for Russia," the *"ad hanc ipsam mentem"* immediately preceding obviously refers also to the more detailed intention given before, i.e., the restoration to the Russian people of peace *(tranquillitatem)* and the liberty to profess their religion. Your final question is answered very emphatically by the order given by Pius XI to Bishops and all the clergy.

SUNG LESSONS ON EMBER DAYS

Question: When a Solemn Mass is celebrated on any of the Ember Saturdays, or on days when there are *more* lessons than the customary Epistle, what is the proper procedure? Should the Subdeacon chant all the lessons and the Epistle; or should a lector chant all the lessons except the Epistle; or should the celebrant simply read all the lessons and the Epistle, leaving the chanting of the Epistle to the Subdeacon?

Answer: "The lessons before the Epistle are sung by a clerical reader, not by the Subdeacon" (J. B. O'Connell, *The Celebration of the Mass* [Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956], p. 607). At the usual time, the Subdeacon removes his folded chasuble, and sings the Epistle.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

PSYCHIATRIC AND HYPNOTIC TREATMENT OF AN ADOLESCENT

Question: A boy of fourteen is emotionally disturbed. His parents are told that psychiatric treatment, including psychoanalysis or even hypnosis, may be beneficial. When the boy is in an hypnotic state the psychiatrist wishes to question him regarding his moral life, perhaps revealing the fact that the boy is addicted to secret sins. Is the boy obliged to submit to the treatment if his parents command him to do so? And, in that event, is the psychiatrist allowed to ask questions concerning any secret sins he may be committing?

Answer: If the boy is so emotionally disturbed that he cannot make a rational decision, the parents could give a psychiatrist permission to treat him, and even to put him in an hypnotic trance, if there is some hope that this will be beneficial. I believe that they could even give permission to the psychiatrist to question the boy about his moral life, if the knowledge thus derived might be beneficial toward the boy's cure. However, this does not mean that the psychiatrist would be permitted to tell the parents that the boy is guilty of habitual masturbation, petty thefts, etc. At most I believe that he could inform them of some strong inclination on the boy's part toward serious crime, such as suicide or murder, since in such a case the practitioner would not be bound by professional secrecy. It should be added that even in the case of a mature son the same right would belong to the parents, if the young man is unable to make reasonable decisions for himself. For the right to make decisions for one who is demented belongs to the next of kin.

On the other hand, if the adolescent is able to make rational decisions for himself, I do not believe that the parents possess the right to oblige him to submit to psychoanalysis or hypnotic treatment against his own will. At most they may try to persuade him, but they may not command him. It is true, in some cases a minor would have to obey his parents in the matter of medical or surgical treatment, particularly when there is question of something definitely and gravely needed for his health. Thus, they could oblige him to have an appendectomy, when otherwise his life would be threatened. Again, the boy of fourteen who wishes to attend a basketball game while he is suffering from a high fever can be com-

manded to go to bed and submit to medical treatment, whether he likes it or not. These are cases in which the natural law itself requires surgery or medication. But to submit a boy in possession of his mental faculties to psychoanalysis or hypnotic treatment, especially when the outcome is very uncertain, and during which the subject's mental powers are directly, though temporarily, hampered in their activity, is something which I believe does not come within the competence of the parents. In a word, I believe that the authority of parents over their minor children does not perdure in its totality until the age of twenty-one, but diminishes gradually—at least from the standpoint of the natural law, whatever the civil law may decree. And I believe that the case presented by our questioner proposes a pertinent example. I would not be ready to render the same decision in regard to a child of eight or nine, even though he has reached the age of reason. But a boy or girl who has attained the age of puberty should be accorded more rights than the younger child. Certainly, the Church acknowledges such a distinction in recognizing in those who have attained to puberty the right to choose their own burial place, not granted to younger children (Can. 1223, § 2), and also by legislating that they can incur ecclesiastical penalties from which younger children are immune (Can. 2230). This entire problem of the extent of parental authority presents theologians a wide and very important field for discussion, on which comparatively little has been written from the moral standpoint.

If the boy agrees to submit to psychoanalysis or hypnotic treatment, he still has the right (beforehand) to decide whether or not questions regarding his moral life are to be asked, and the psychiatrist or hypnotist must abide by his decision. In the event of a refusal, when the practitioner feels that unless this field is opened to treatment nothing can be accomplished, he should simply determine not to treat the case.

Even in the event that the youth consents to questioning on his moral life, the psychiatrist or hypnotist is bound by professional secrecy to keep strictly confidential the knowledge he thus acquires and to use it only in treating the boy privately. He may not reveal it to the parents, unless the boy explicitly grants permission. The one exception would be that mentioned above—the danger that the youth is likely to commit a serious crime.

CERTAINTY OF THE FULFILLMENT OF THE PREMARITAL GUARANTEES

Question: Canon 1061 lays down as one of the conditions for the obtaining of a dispensation for a mixed marriage that "there be moral certainty of the fulfillment of the guarantees." On whom does the responsibility rest of securing such certainty? How can it best be obtained?

Answer: As the questioner points out, one of the three conditions required in order that a dispensation for a mixed marriage be validly granted is that "there be moral certainty that the guarantees (promises) will be fulfilled." The other two conditions are that there be just and grave reasons for the marriage and that the non-Catholic promise not to endanger the faith of the Catholic, while both promise that all the children will be baptized and brought up as Catholics (Can. 1061). The same conditions must be fulfilled for the obtaining of a dispensation from disparity of cult (Can. 1071).

Of course, there can be no *absolute* certainty of what the couple will do regarding the promises. We can never be *absolutely* certain how human beings will act in the future, however sincere their promises may seem to be at present. Hence, the Church, in dispensing from the marriage impediment between a Catholic and a non-Catholic, demands no more than *moral certainty* that the guarantees will be fulfilled by both parties—and this moral certainty can be based on only probable reasons.

The obligation to have such certainty rests basically on the one who grants the dispensation, the Ordinary. Nevertheless, he cannot be expected to investigate every case personally, at least in a large diocese; hence, he must rely on the judgment of others, especially pastors and priests who conduct the premarital investigation. A bishop will ordinarily act prudently if he leaves this matter to the wisdom and zeal of his priests, and accepts their decision without further questioning.

But how is the priest to go about securing the necessary moral certainty that the promises will be observed? Certainly the mere willingness of the parties to sign the promises is not sufficient. For if this were the case, the Church would not have to add a third condition to the requirements for a dispensation, since the second condition already includes the willingness to make the promises.

Some of the signs, I believe, would be these: If the non-Catholic, on his first meeting with the priest, spontaneously asserts that he will willingly make the promises and will conscientiously live up to them. . . . If the non-Catholic willingly takes a course of instruction in Catholic doctrine and shows a sincere interest in the Catholic faith. . . . If the non-Catholic, asked pointblank what he would do about the bringing up of the children in the event of their mother's death, replies with apparent sincerity that he would bring them up as Catholics. . . . If there are already several members of the non-Catholic's family who have contracted a mixed marriage, and are faithfully fulfilling the guarantees. . . . If the non-Catholic is devout in his own religion, yet unhesitatingly makes the promises.

I do not believe that any of these signs by itself would always give adequate certainty that the guarantees will be observed; but I feel that two or more of these or similar signs should satisfy the conscience of the priest in asking for a dispensation. On the other hand, if the non-Catholic manifests a surly attitude, is unwilling to take any instructions in the Catholic faith, shows that he regards the guarantees as a mere formality, complains of the "unfairness of the Church" in demanding a Catholic upbringing for all the children, etc., I do not see how a priest can lawfully seek a dispensation for the marriage.

One point in particular must be stressed in this connection. In recent times it has become quite common for the non-Catholic partner in a mixed marriage to protest, after the birth of a child, that he was forced to sign the promises and consequently he is not bound in conscience to observe them. Of course, such a claim is utterly illogical. The Church never forces any non-Catholic to marry a Catholic or to sign the promises. On the contrary, the Church would prefer that he would refuse to sign the promises, give up the idea of marrying a Catholic, and instead marry someone of his own religious denomination. The truth is, he is forcing the Church to let him marry a Catholic, and the Church is going as far as she can in giving in to him. But, by God's law, the guarantees are necessary. At any rate, to forestall this objection, I suggest that whenever a priest is preparing a couple for a mixed marriage, he ask the non-Catholic if he feels that any force is being applied to make him sign the promises, and if he will ever attempt to excuse himself from fulfilling them on the ground that he was under coercion. If he will not answer in the affirmative (perhaps even in

writing), I believe that the application for a dispensation should be refused. For, in such a situation, I cannot see how there can be moral certainty that the guarantees will be observed.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1910, is the first of a series on "The Sacred Scriptures on Mixed Marriages" by the Very Rev. P. Meagher, of Singleton, Australia. In this first article the author limits himself to the Old Testament, describing a number of instances in which the Almighty showed His displeasure when any of the chosen people contracted a marriage with a member of a gentile race. For example, Solomon was severely punished for entering into marital unions with women who worshipped strange gods (*III Kings* 11:1-12). The author concludes with a parallel between the divine legislation of pre-Christian times and the Church's attitude toward mixed marriages: "It is an object lesson of the most useful kind; and the Church of God, the divinely appointed guardian of faith and morals, even if she had no other evidence before her and had not the Spirit of God to guide her, could never adopt any other attitude toward them than that of open and determined hostility." . . . An interesting account of the religious festivals celebrated in Brittany, France, and known as "Pardons," comes from the pen of L. E. Dobrée, of Clevedon, England. . . . Fr. M. Martin, S.J., contributes the last of his series of articles on the Roman Congregations. . . . Fr. David Barry, of Ireland, writes on "Promises, their Nature and Obligation." Under promises he includes vows. He asserts that "when we take a vow there is first, as a substratum of merit, an act of justice." The ordinary "pledge" to avoid intoxicants, he claims, "does not involve any new obligation toward God or in the virtue of religion." Consequently, to transgress it in any particular instance cannot be more than a venial fault. . . . Fr. H. Hughes, of England, writing on "Apologetics for the Common Man," advises the use of Church history in popular apologetics, as well as the practice of pointing out the consonance of the Catholic religion with the needs and nature of man. . . . In the Analecta we find the text of the memorable decree *Quam singulari*, issued by the Congregation of the Sacraments on August 8, 1910, declaring that children are to be admitted to their First Communion as soon as they attain the age of reason, about their seventh year. An excellent commentary by Fr. John T. McNicholas, O.P., is appended.

F. J. C.

Book Reviews

THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH FOR SALVATION IN SELECTED THEOLOGICAL WRITINGS OF THE PAST CENTURY. By John J. King, O.M.I., Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. xxvii + 363. $6.00.

Several years ago in a non-Catholic periodical, a reviewer surveyed a number of works by Catholic authors on the subject of the reunion of Christendom. With tongue-in-cheek, no doubt, he set it down as his impression that "there was no one Roman Catholic position on the subject." Without going into the merits of this observation, we might well imagine what the superficial reaction might be relative to the subject chosen by Father King for his doctoral dissertation!

Two years ago, Msgr. Joseph C. Fenton put forth his important work, *The Catholic Church and Salvation* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1958), in which he treated, in exegetical fashion and in historical sequence, the official documents of the sacred *Magisterium* on the subject. Fr. King complements this treatment by examining the ways in which the theologians have handled the same matter. Taking the letter of the Holy Office of 8 August 1949, *Suprema hac sacra*, as normative, he proceeds to take up, chronologically, the various authors, beginning with Perrone's *Praelectiones* which appeared in 1840 and moves systematically onwards up to the contemporary era. The designation of "selected theological writings" in his title is most modest; the number of authors examined range in the neighborhood of some three hundred. While not exhaustive, the coverage is certainly more than adequate and representative for the purpose. Let it not be inferred that the work is simply a dull catalogue of opinions strung together. There is analysis and evaluation; every chapter has a summary recording the recurrent themes of the period treated, with developments noted. The presentation, moreover, is readable and clear.

The volume might be regarded as a substantial contribution to theological literature on a subject which is assuming increasing importance in these days. The energy and competence which Father King has displayed in this effort give us ground for hope that other valuable contributions of his will enrich the field of ecclesiology in which he has proven himself to be a master.

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.

PLATONISM IN RECENT RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By William D. Geoghegan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. Pp. 200. $4.00.

Mr. Geoghegan discusses the influences of Plato on W. R. Inge, Paul Elmer More, A. E. Taylor, William Temple, A. N. Whitehead, and George Santayana. He distinguishes Platonism, the Platonic tradition, and Platonism today. He studies Platonism as a whole in its relation to five major ideas: God, the Ideal, natural existence, historical existence, and the nature and destiny of man.

He links Inge and More as more or less full Christian Platonists; Taylor and Temple as less classically Platonic, though steeped in the Platonic tradition and under modern Platonic influence; Whitehead and Santayana as rather Naturalists, and more independently modern in revising Platonism.

He concludes that the Christian faith is not presented in its full vigor by the Christian Platonists, except possibly by Temple; and that neither Whitehead nor Santayana represent Plato or the Platonic tradition adequately. Neither Christianity nor Naturalism coincide with Platonism; but the fascination of Plato draws thinkers in both these camps near to him.

Mr. Geoghegan's book is too short to be more than stimulating; too plainly conceived and expressed to be more than studious. He approvingly quotes A. N. Whitehead's "All of philosophy is but a footnote to Plato," but does not give evidence of recognizing the rather substantial and revolutionary footnote—that knowledge is not by confrontation of subject and object but by identity—which Aristotle entered in philosophic history, shifting thereby the pivotal point quite drastically.

MICHAEL NOVAK, C.S.C.

THE PRAYERS OF POPE PIUS XII. Trans. by Martin W. Schoenberg, O.S.C. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1957. Pp. xiv + 115. $2.50.

THE LORD'S PRAYER. By Romano Guardini. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc., 1958. Pp. 125. $2.75.

This work is a translation from the Italian *Preghiere di Pio XII*, published in Rome "a cura della Pontificia Opera di Assistenza." In this collection of prayers of the late Holy Father the reader is immediately aware of their intensely personal and ardent nature. These are prayers a Pope would say, and they contain all the feeling and spirituality that marked Pope Pius XII. There is scarcely anyone who

is not aware (either by personal contact, or by the ordinary media of communication) of the spiritual nature, and the understanding evidenced by Pius XII. A learned man, a man of deep insight into the problems of his people, vitally interested in the cares of his flock, Pope Pius XII has manifested these interests in these prayers.

The purpose of the book is expressed in an introductory note by His Excellency, Leo A. Pursley, Bishop of Fort Wayne. "I sincerely hope that the voice of the Vicar of Christ, speaking so fervently to God, will speak through these pages to the hearts of many, communicating to them his own spirit and carrying them beyond the printed word to the intimacy of personal communion with God."

Indeed the reader will be delighted with the wealth of prayers for every occasion and for every group of persons. Covering such diversified subjects as the Marian Year prayer, boy scouts, women, the Church of Silence, Easter prayer, prayer for priests, centennial year prayer for the pilgrims to Lourdes, prayers for the sick and suffering, as well as prayers to various saints including the North American Martyrs, the reader will find prayers suitable for every occasion.

Of equal importance is the tracing of historic events through these prayers in as much as they were composed for the pressing needs of the times. Throughout the prayers there is clearly revealed the immense charity and feeling for others characteristic of the author. Truly these prayers present an intimate picture of the late Father of Christendom which could not be obtained in any other manner. His care for and interest in protecting his people from the dangers of the present times, both spiritual and physical, are beautifully expressed. For those who need prayers—and who does not?—and for those who wish to know the Holy Father intimately, this book is recommended.

* * *

It is remarkable that one can say the Lord's Prayer so frequently and yet have so little knowledge of its meaning. In this work, the author's reverent and spiritual interpretation give the familiar phrases new clarity. The words and petitions dulled by familiarity and habit are made to take on new meaning. As Monsignor Guardini considers each section and links it to the whole, he reveals many layers of meaning in the one prayer that has been given to Christians by God Himself.

The author has won for himself an international reputation as a modern writer who strives to reinterpret religious truths for the modern world. In this work he has related the full sense of the words of this most familiar of prayers and has related these meanings to the

Christian's present-day problems and to the psychology of modern man. Anyone who undertakes to comment upon the Lord's Prayer joins an illustrious line which goes back a long way. From the first century onwards, Christian thinkers and men of prayer have been seeking to explore its depths. It is with some trepidation that anyone should undertake this exploration. However, no one seems more qualified than the author of this book. That it is needed is without question, for as Monsignor Guardini states in his prefatory remarks, "the words of revelation call each age to interpret them afresh."

Great emphasis is placed by the author on the petition, "Thy will be done." Here is the gateway to the prayer; it is requisite for its comprehension. His interpretation of the same phrase as the third petition of the prayer is thorough and incisive as it is applied to man's relationship with God in heaven and on earth. For in the understanding of this petition are the others made clear and the relation of one to the other revealed.

To re-think one's daily prayer under the guidance of the author should lead to a revitalizing of the spiritual life, and to a more active commitment in the province of practical life. Those familiar with the author's *Prayer in Practice* will find this work a helpful adjunct. Those not familiar with the works of Guardini will do well to begin here.

JOHN F. NEVINS

THUNDER IN THE DISTANCE. By Jacques Leclercq. New York: Sheed & Ward, Inc., 1958. Pp. viii + 322. $5.00.

Thunder in the Distance will warm the heart of every priest, inspire every missionary, and encourage every man of God who is trying to be a contemplative in the midst of action. For here is the well-told story of Father Vincent Lebbe, a missionary to China at the turn of the century, who lived, loved, and labored through forty of the most crucial years of Holy Mother the Church in the Orient. From 1900 to 1940 he was intimately involved in the national and ecclesiastical shaping of events that are now coming to a head in the Nationalism and Communism of the Far East.

Father Leclercq, who once heard his hero speak in France, has endeavored to give us an insight into the future apostle with a short and enjoyable look at his early family life in Belgium and France. Along with his own comments and keen perception, the author includes an interesting portion of Père Lebbe's writings, from letters and other papers, which greatly enhance this fascinating account of a modern St. Paul.

In one letter Père Lebbe writes: ". . . you will realize . . . that the only thing, the only thing that counts, is to love God above all things and one's neighbor as oneself—and more than oneself for most of the time!" And again: "I am a Chinese. Don't look at my nose or my eyes: look into my heart. We must make China a great country by making it Christian and giving it men who keep their integrity even when they become mandarins . . ."

This man who was to be responsible for the consecration of China's first native bishops once wrote: "Patriotism, especially as it has developed under Christianity and exists now among all nations conscious of themselves as such, is above all a form of love, a creative upsurge of devotion and self-sacrifice, a great ideal and therefore a great force. It is not simply a question of general utility, but something far greater —the shiver in the soul at the sound of one's national anthem, the breath that bares the proudest heads at the sight of the national flag."

An excellent background to the present difficulites in China, a happy introduction to the Chinese people, a step by step study of the progress of the Church, a reader will finish this book with a greater appreciation of a patriot, a people, and love in action.

WILLIAM M. WHITE

Books Received

LITURGY AND THE MISSIONS: THE NIJMEGEN PAPERS. Edited by Johannes Hofinger, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1960. Pp. xii + 308. $5.95.

PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN: HIS LIFE AND SPIRIT. By Nicholas Corte. Translated by Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R. New York: Macmillan, 1960. Pp. xx + 120. $3.25.

THE MANIFESTATION OF CONSCIENCE. By Dacian Dee, O.F.M.Cap. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. x + 101. $3.00.

TECHNOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN CULTURE. Edited by Robert Paul Mohan. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. 144. $3.95.

PROBLEMS IN THEOLOGY. Volume II: THE COMMANDMENTS. By John McCarthy. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xiii + 588. $7.50.

BILDERGEBETBUCH. By Basilius Senger, O.S.B. and Otto Andreas Schreiber. Essen: Ludgerus Verlag, 1960. Pp. 80. DM 5.80.

SCRIPTURE IN THE LITURGY. By Charles Burgard. Translated by J. Holland Smith. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. x + 163. $3.00.

PLUS PRÈS DE DIEU: BRÈVES RÉFLEXIONS POUR LES FÊTES ET LES DIMANCHES. Volume III. By Gaston Salet, S.J. Paris: Lethielleux, 1960. Pp. 151. NF 6,40.

POUR UNE ÉCONOMIE DU BIEN COMMUN SELON LA DOCTRINE SOCIALE DE L'ÉGLISE. By Georges Ducoin. Paris: Lethielleux, 1960. Pp. 142. NF 6,90.

INTRODUCTION À L'ÉTUDE DE LA THÉOLOGIE DU MARRIAGE. By Henri Rondet. Paris: Lethielleux, 1960. Pp. 202. NF 9,60.

LA SAINTE VIERGE ET LA MYSTIQUE DES VOEUX. By François Charmot, S.J. Paris: Lethielleux, 1960. Pp. 132. NF 7,90.

ALL LOST IN WONDER. By Walter J. Burghardt, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xi + 220. $3.50.

THE CONVERSION OF AUGUSTINE. By Romano Guardini. Translated by Elinor Briefs. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. xviii + 258. $3.95.

DE SACREMENTIS IN GENERE. By Clarence McAuliffe, S.J. St. Louis: Herder, 1960. Pp. xv + 224. $4.00.

MEDITATIONS ON THE LOVE OF GOD. By John Nicholas Grou, S.J. Translated by the Benedictines of Teignmouth. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960. Pp. x + 172. $3.50.

CHRISTIAN INITIATION. By Louis Bouyer. Translated by J. R. Foster. New York: Macmillan, 1960. Pp. 148. $3.50.

DIVINE MERCY IN THE DOCTRINE AND PRAYERS OF THE CHURCH. By Julian Chrosciechowski, M.I.C. Stockbridge, Mass.: Marian Fathers, 1960. Pp. 90. 50¢.

SCIENCE AND THE CATHOLIC TRADITION. By Ernan McMullin. New York: The America Press, 1960. Pp. 20. 15¢.

RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE IN CATHOLIC TRADITION. By Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro. New York: The America Press, 1960. Pp. 25. 15¢.

LITURGY AND CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Raphael Clynes, O.F.M. Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1960. Pp. xii + 428. $4.00.

GETTING TO KNOW PICTURES. By Barbara Whelpton. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960. Pp. 144. $4.75.

CODE OF ORIENTAL LAW: THE LAW ON PERSONS. English Translation and Differential Commentary. By Victor J. Pospishil. Ford City, Pa.: St. Mary's Ukrainian Catholic Church, 1960. Pp. xvi + 342. $7.00.

THE PENAL REMEDIES OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW. By Paul L. Love. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1960. Pp. xii + 179. $3.00.